

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AT
SALEM, COLUMBIANA CO., OHIO.

JAMES BARNABY, Jr., General Agent.

BENJAMIN S. JONES, }
J. ELIZABETH JONES, } EDITORS.

PUBLISHING COMMITTEE:—Samuel Brooke,
James Barnaby, Jr., David L. Galbreath,
Lot Holmes.

From the National A. S. Standard.

Lysander Spooner on the Unconstitutionality of Slavery.

"DOMESTIC SLAVERY IS THE MOST PROMINENT FEATURE IN THE ARISTOCRATIC GOVERNANCE OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION."—Governor Morris in the Convention of 1787. Madison Papers, 1261.

We have read with attention the many columns which Mr. Goodell has showered upon us from various quarters, and can say, with perfect sincerity, without meaning to be satirical, that they contain nothing which needs any notice from us, or which can mislead a thoughtful reader of our previous criticism.

Next in order of time comes the Essay of Lysander Spooner on the Unconstitutionality of Slavery. We shall but fulfil an old promise in reviewing the argument it contains. Events beyond our control have delayed us till now, which we regret only as it seems to have led some of Mr. Spooner's admirers to imagine that the delay proceeded from an unwillingness, on our part, to measure lances with so skilful an adversary. We exhort them, on the contrary, to believe that we have no innate antipathy to the idea of an Anti-Slavery Constitution—that so far from being obstinately wedded to our own opinion, Mr. Spooner, or any one else, shall find in us a most ready, willing, and easy convert to a doctrine, which will restore to us the power of voting—a right we much covet—and a direct share in the Government of the country—a privilege we appreciate as highly as any one can. Only convince us fairly and we will outdo Alvan Stewart himself in glowing eulogy of this new found virtue of the American Constitution. Indeed if merely believing the Constitution to be Anti-Slavery would really make it so, we would be the last to stir the question. If the beautiful theories of some of our friends could out from its place the ugly reality of a pro-slavery administration, we would sit quiet, and let Spooner and Goodell convert the nation at their leisure. But alas, the ostrich does not get rid of his enemy by hiding his head in the sand. Slavery is not abolished, although we have persuaded ourselves that it does not exist. The pro-slavery clauses of the Northern Compact still stand there in full operation, notwithstanding our logic. The Constitution will never be amended by persons who have no intention of amendment. National evils are only cured by holding men's eyes open, and forcing them to gaze on the hideous reality. To be able to meet a crisis men must understand and appreciate it.

All that we have to do, as Abolitionists, with Mr. Spooner's argument is to consider its influences on the Anti-Slavery cause. He maintains that the Judges of the United States Courts have the right to declare Slavery illegal, and he proposes that they should be made to do so. We believe that in part he mistakes fancy for argument, in part he bases his conclusions on a forced interpretation of legal maxims, and that the rest of his reasoning, where not logically absurd and self-contradictory, is subversive of all sound principles of Government and of public faith. Any movement or party, therefore, founded on his plan, would, so soon as it grew considerable enough to attract public attention, be met by the contempt and disapprobation of every enlightened and honest man. To trust our cause with such a leader is to insure its shipwreck. To keep, therefore, so far as our influence extends, the Anti-Slavery movement in its legitimate channel, to base it on such principles as shall deserve and command the assent of every candid man, to hold up constantly before the nation the mirror of its own deformity, we undertake the distasteful task of proving the Constitution hostile to us and the slave.

It is but justice to Mr. Spooner to acknowledge that his performance differs from most of those which have preceded it, not only in the ingenuity of the argument, but in the honest aim of the writer. With him "the wish" does not appear to have been "father to the thought." He did not first find a party and then stretch out both hands to clutch something that would sustain him in the right of voting at all. He did not violate his own convictions, and then, obstinately shutting his eyes cry out, "I don't see where I am inconsistent." His logic does not grow out of a lingering love of the ballot, or a secret desire to put "non-resistance hors du combat." He did not vote in order to save a corrupt and trembling Church and shield it from the storm of deserved rebuke, endeavor to build an ark of political refuge out of legal scraps and disjointed and misunderstood quotations. He seems to have persuaded himself of the truth of his own theory, and then to have thrown it out fearlessly to the world, trusting in its truth to make it useful, and with no ulterior object or private end to serve.

Before we touch on the argument of Mr. Spooner's Essay, we wish to call attention to two points:

1st. Allowing, for the moment, as he claims, that the Constitution contains no guarantee or recognition of Slavery—and granting him, also, in his own words:

"That the instrument was plain, and the people had common-sense; and those two facts cannot stand together consistently with the idea that there was any general or even considerable misunderstanding of its meaning."—(p. 126 2d Edition.)

We go on to ask, (of Abolitionists, not of Mr. Spooner,) how comes it that, as he all along confesses, Courts, Congress, and the people have uniformly warped and twisted the whole instrument aside and avowed to serve and sustain Slavery? That the whole Administration of the Government, from its very commencement, has been pro-slavery? If the Constitution be guiltless of any blame in this matter, then surely there must be some powerful element at work in the Union itself, which renders it impossible for this to be an

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

VOL. 2.—NO. 35.

SALEM, OHIO, FRIDAY, APRIL 2, 1847.

WHOLE NO. 87.

Anti-Slavery nation, even when blessed with an Anti-Slavery Constitution; and the experience of fifty years proves Union itself, under any form, to be impossible without guilt. In such circumstances, no matter what the Constitution is, whether good or bad, it is the duty of every honest man to join in the war-cry of the American Anti-Slavery Society, "no Union with Slaveholders." For if we could not escape the infamy and the sin of such a pro-slavery administration, as ours always has been, under a Constitution pure as Mr. Spooner describes this to be, then, as we never can have a better, we ought to give up the experiment.

2d. As far as we can understand him, Mr. Spooner does not deny the universal Northern doctrine, that the Executive officers of the Government are bound, while they retain their situations, to obey and execute the laws in that manner and sense which the Supreme Court decide and enjoin. (His views of the duty of the Supreme Court itself we have stated and shall soon discuss. But from the importance he attaches to them we have a right to infer his concurrence in the opinion that the decisions of that Court are binding on the other departments of Government.) For if they are not so, of what consequence is it that those decisions are? Of course no one has ever denied that the Supreme Court now construes the Constitution in a pro-slavery sense. This, then, is the law of the land until altered. Here again the position of the American Anti-Slavery Society is untouched. For whatever be the real character of the Constitution, if those who now swear to support that instrument are bound to support it in the sense which the Courts give it, then, surely, no Abolitionist can consistently take such an oath or ask another person to do so.

With neither of these points has Mr. Spooner himself anything to do. He, we believe, does not profess to be an Abolitionist; at least, in this Essay he considers the question simply as a lawyer, without entering into its further bearings. We suggest them for the benefit of those Abolitionists who try to hide themselves behind him, and make a use of his argument which he never intended, and probably would not sanction. Mr. Spooner's first chapter is employed in answering the question, "what is law?"

"That law, I mean, which, and which only, judicial tribunals are morally bound, under all circumstances, to declare and sustain." In answering this question, I shall attempt to show that law is an intelligible principle of right, necessarily resulting from the nature of man; and not an arbitrary rule, that can be established by mere will, numbers, or power."—(p. 5, 2d Edition.)

His conclusion is, "that law is simply the rule, principle, obligation, or requirement of natural justice."—(p. 6.)

"If, then, law really be nothing other than the rule, principle, obligation, or requirement of natural justice, it follows that government can have no powers except such as individuals may rightfully delegate to it; that no law, inconsistent with men's natural rights, can arise out of any contract or compact of government; that constitutional law, under any form of government, consists only of those principles of the written Constitution, that are consistent with natural law, and men's natural rights; and that any other principles, that may be expressed by the letter of any Constitution, are void and not law, and all judicial tribunals are bound to declare them so."—(p. 14, 2d Edition.)

We might pass this chapter by without notice as not concerning our inquiry, since Mr. Spooner not only conducts his argument afterward without reference to it, but distinctly allows that a definition exactly the opposite of his is the one usually adopted by the people, by Courts of Justice, and by Governments. So that,

"The very name of law has come to signify little more than an arbitrary command of power without reference to its justice or its injustice; its innocence or its criminality."—(p. 9.)

Our only object is to abolish Slavery, and not to correct the fundamental ideas which men hold as to law or Government; and hence, all we have to do with law is to find out what it practically is, and then amend it if we can. We might, therefore, we repeat, pass this chapter by, taking law to mean what Mr. Spooner allows that our Judicial tribunals, our Government, and the general sense of the people have defined it to be, in the words he quotes from Noah Webster, "a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the Supreme power of a State, commanding what its subjects are to do and prohibiting what they are to forbear."

Or as Heinemann describes it:

"Civil laws are the commands of the Supreme power of a State."

Or as Chancellor Kent defines it:

"Municipal law is a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the Supreme power in a State."

Or with Nathan Dane, the author of the Ordinance of 1787:

"Municipal or civil law is the rule of municipal or civil conduct prescribed by the superior power in the State commanding what the Legislature deems right, and prohibiting what it deems wrong."

Or with C. Justice Wilmot:

"Statute law is the will of the Legislature in writing—common law is nothing but statutes worn out by time."

Or with the Roman law, from which Mr. Spooner takes some of his definitions:

"What the people command, let that be law." XII tables of Rome.

"The will of the Prince, that is law."—Justinian's Inst.

"The rule which each State chooses for itself, that is the law of such State." Ibid.

We might extend these, but they are only the varied expression of what Mr. Spooner allows is the generally accepted definition; further quotation is useless.

We shall, however, dwell awhile on this chapter. Mr. Spooner himself draws the line very clearly and fairly between his own speculations and what he allows to be the generally received definition, and never confuses the two. But that portion of the Abolitionists who are misled by his book, often find their greatest difficulty in the points discussed in this chapter. We shall endeavor therefore to unravel it a little, since the views it contains are not new, but have been floating a long time in the Anti-Slavery horizon—and only spared because no one has cared to notice them.

Mr. Spooner's doctrine is, that "only what is just and right is law." This proposition is both true and false, simply because the word law has many meanings, like its Latin synonym *lex*, which Dr. Taylor says (Elem. Civil Law), has forty significations. The most usual source of mistake in argument is the use of ambiguous terms. Now, Mr. Spooner's proposition is true of the law of Nature, which Cicero calls "right reason, the same thing at Athens as at Rome;" but is false when applied to municipal, national, civil law, which is often a very different thing at Louisville from what it is at London. It is with this civil law only that we have to do in an argument like the present. Mr. Spooner's quotations at the close of this chapter, relate mostly to the law of Nature, to law in its most comprehensive sense, or the science of Justice; such as Hooker's sublime poetry, assuring us of law "that her seat is in the bosom of God, and her voice the harmony of the world."

This discussion, however, is a matter of no consequence to the argument. Leaving it, therefore, let us consider Mr. Spooner's main proposition. "Only that which is just, is law, and all judicial tribunals are bound so to declare;" taking law to mean the rule of civil affairs in a nation, the only sense of the term with which this argument has anything to do.

In the first place a proposition may justly be suspected not to be sound, when the author confesses in regard to it, as Mr. Spooner does here, that,

"It may make sad havoc with constitutions and statute books," and "it is possible, perhaps, that this doctrine would spare enough of our existing Constitution to save our Governments from the necessity of a new organization!"

Surely mankind cannot be presumed to have so uniformly mistaken what they were about, as to have uniformly set up Governments, that were not legal in their own sense of the term? And as surely words must be interpreted according to the sense mankind chose to put upon them, and not according to the caprice of an individual. Mr. Spooner is at liberty to say that much of what the world calls law, is not obligatory because it is not just in the eye of God; and there all good men will agree with him. But to assert that because a thing is not right it is not law, as that term is commonly and rightfully used, is entering into the question of what constitutes the basis of government among men; and according to a man's theory of government, will be his denial or assent to the proposition. Does Mr. Spooner mean to say merely, that a nation in making its laws has no right, in the eye of God, to perpetrate injustice? We agree with him. It is a doctrine certainly as old as Cicero, and may be traced through Grotius and Locke, and all writers on the subject, down to Jefferson and Channing. Nations are bound by the same rule of right and wrong, as individuals—agreed. Or does he mean to say that in settling what shall be the rule of civil conduct the voice of the majority is not final and conclusive, or its own officers in all the departments of Government? Then we differ from him, entirely, and assert that on his plan Government is impossible. An individual may, and ought to resign his office, rather than assist in a law he deems unjust. But while he retains, under the majority, one of their offices, he retains it on their conditions, which are, to obey and enforce their decrees. There can be no more self-evident proposition than that in every Government, the majority must rule, and their will be uniformly obeyed. Now, if the majority enact a wicked law, and the Judge refuses to enforce it, which is to yield, the Judge or the majority? Of course the first.

According to Mr. Spooner, no provision would be law until it had secured the assent, not only of the Legislature—the power appointed to make laws—but of the Judiciary also—the power appointed only to construe and apply them. Apply this principle to our Union and it brings upon the present Constitution a similar disease to that which killed the old Confederation, under which laws were of no practical value unless the several States chose to execute them. According to Mr. Spooner, however, it is an evil inseparable from all forms of Government, since every decision of the National Legislature must be perpetually subject to the discretionary power of every Court in the twenty-eight States!

"Only that which is just, is law, and all judicial tribunals are bound so to declare." This is Mr. Spooner's proposition. Grant, for the purpose of this argument, that only what is just is law. We allow that no laws in support of slavery are morally binding. Possibly Mr. Spooner means the same thing, only expresses it more forcibly. The only important point at issue is—when Governments enact such laws, what is the proper remedy?

This question has been answered in three ways.

1st. Old-fashioned patriotism replies with Algernon Sydney, "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God." Mr. Spooner states that "the only duties any one owes to a wicked Constitution, are disobedience, resistance, destruction."

2d. Next comes the Christian rule, that too sanctioned by Locke, and by Plato—the course of the Quakers—the motto of the American Anti-Slavery Society—"Suffer to every ordinance of man"—but suffer any principle rather than join in doing a wrong act; meanwhile, let your loud protest prepare a speedy and quiet revolution.

3d. Thirdly comes Mr. Spooner's plan: "If the majority, however large, of the people of a country, enter into a contract of government, called a Constitution, by which they agree to aid, abet, or accomplish any kind of injustice, this contract of government is unlawful and void—and for the same reason that a contract of the same nature between two individuals, is unlawful and void. Such a contract of government confers no right, no authority upon those appointed to administer it."

rather than join in doing a wrong act; meanwhile, let your loud protest prepare a speedy and quiet revolution.

"If the majority, however large, of the people of a country, enter into a contract of government, called a Constitution, by which they agree to aid, abet, or accomplish any kind of injustice, this contract of government is unlawful and void—and for the same reason that a contract of the same nature between two individuals, is unlawful and void. Such a contract of government confers no right, no authority upon those appointed to administer it."

"Judicial tribunals, sitting under the authority of this unlawful contract or Constitution, are bound, equally with other men, to declare it, and all unjust enactments passed by the Government in pursuance of it, unlawful and void. These judicial tribunals cannot, by accepting office under a Government, rid themselves of that paramount obligation, that all men are under, to declare, if they declare anything, that justice is law; that Government can have no lawful powers, except those with which it has been invested by lawful contract; and that an unlawful contract for the establishment of Government, is as unlawful and void as any other contract to do injustice."

"No oaths, which judicial or other officers may take, to carry out and support an unlawful contract or Constitution of Government, are of any moral obligation."—(p. 9.)

And here begins the real and only important dispute between us. The reader may forget, if he pleases, all we have said. Mr. Spooner's differences all our own, up to this point, are mere questions of theory. It matters little which side be adopted. His position now is:

That laws and Constitutions which violate justice, are void. They are as little binding in the eye of the law, as in the eye of God. They are legally as well as morally void.

So far we agree with him, or differ so slightly, that here we care not to dispute the matter. He goes on:

A Judge holding office under such Constitutions is authorized and bound to treat them as void, and to decide cases, not according to them, but as his sense "of natural justice" dictates.

Here we differ from him, maintaining that the position of the officers of such a Government differs from that of private individuals, their duty is to resign their post whenever unwilling to fulfil the conditions on which they received their offices, and not to treat the laws as void.

This question is not to be confounded with one somewhat similar to it, and which has been sometimes discussed, especially in England, whether a Judge there may disregard an unjust statute? Our present question is different, for it should be remembered that in England there is no written Constitution. Even if a Judge had such powers there, which he has not, it would by no means follow, that he had the same under our form of Government. There the Judge swears, simply to bear true allegiance to the King. It might, therefore, with some plausibility, be argued that having no test to which to bring acts of Parliament, except the rules of natural justice, Judges were authorized to declare them void when inconsistent with those rules. Such a doctrine, however, is repudiated by the almost unanimous voice of the English law.

However the case may be in England, here the case is different. Our Government is founded on contract. So agrees Mr. Spooner:

"The Constitution is a contract; a written contract, consisting of a certain number of precise words, to which, and to which only, all parties to it have, in theory, agreed. Manifestly neither this contract, nor the meaning of its words, can be changed, without the consent of all the parties to it."—(p. 123.)

"A contract for the establishment of Government, being nothing but a voluntary contract between individuals for their mutual benefit, differs in nothing that is essential to its validity from any other contract between man and man, or between nation and nation."—(p. 8.)

"Our Constitutions are but contracts."—Note p. 8.

Under our Constitution then, the people and the office-holder make a contract together. They grant him certain specified powers, and demand of him certain specified duties. He deliberately looks over the catalogue (that is, the Constitution)—assents to it—swears that he agrees to it, and will perform his part—and so takes office and acquires power. That power, Mr. Spooner thinks, he may retain while he refuses to perform the conditions on which he received it; and that power, granted him expressly, and only for the support of the Constitution, he is bound to use for the destruction of that instrument. Mr. Spooner's ground is that, "immoral contracts are void." Granted; but if they are absolute nullities, then the Governments supposed to spring from them, do not exist, since they have nothing to spring from. Accordingly, the supposed Judge is no Judge, and has no authority to declare or decide anything.

As Mr. Spooner says, (p. 9.) "Such a contract of Government confers no right, no authority upon those appointed to administer it." Of course he would not have a Judge use a wrongful authority for any purpose.

Again, "immoral contracts are not binding." True. But if I receive a sum of money, on my promise to commit murder, and afterward, my moral sense awakens, and I refuse to do the deed, does that authorize me to retain the money? Such a moral sense would be a most accommodating one! and such goodness might well be "accounted gain!"

The rule plainly is that if power is put into our hands, on certain conditions, and we become, from any cause, unable or unwilling to fulfil those conditions, we ought to surrender

back the power to those who granted it. If, therefore, the Constitution is pro-slavery, (as Mr. Spooner and ourselves are now supposing it to be,) the Judges have agreed to do certain pro-slavery acts, and they must perform their whole contract, or yield up the power they received on that condition. Judges are the people's servants, employed to do certain acts. If they cannot do those acts, let them "be no longer stewards."

This argument seems to us conclusive as it stands. But Mr. Spooner's principles give it additional force. He says (p. 29, 2d edition,) that

"Here office is not given to any one because he has a right to it, nor because it may be even a benefit to him. It is conferred upon him, or rather confided to him, as a trust, and solely as a trust, for the sole benefit of the people of the United States. The President, as President, is not supposed to have any rights in the office on his own account; or any rights except what the people, for their own benefit, and not for his, have voluntarily chosen to grant to him."

If this be so—if the President, or Judge, has no right but what the people have granted him, will Mr. Spooner affirm that the people ever granted to any Judge the right to disregard the pro-slavery clauses of their Constitution? If office be a "trust, and solely a trust," is the trust-holder to execute his duty according to his own views or according to the trust deed?

Again, Mr. Goodell had maintained that Governments have certain inherent powers, as that, for instance, of abolishing Slavery, and executing justice, &c.—that these enter into the very idea of a Government—and every Government possesses them, whether specifically granted to it or not; but Mr. Spooner (p. 8), scolds as "an imposture, the idea of any necessary or inherent authority or sovereignty in our Government, as such"—and maintains that they are nothing but "contracts." If, then, they are only contracts, will he explain where Judges get a power which the other party to the contract never meant to give them?

When, therefore, Mr. Spooner or any one else has shown us an English Judge, for instance, putting aside an act of Parliament because of its injustice, he has not then reached our case. Let him show an English Judge holding himself authorized to disregard the terms of the union between Scotland and England, and between Ireland and England, and he will have advanced somewhere within sight of the position of an American Magistrate under our Constitution. Even those, however, are not equally strong cases, for such a Judge has never expressly sworn to maintain those compacts.

The royal oath to maintain "the church established" comes nearest to our case, and it is well known with what scrupulous anxiety the profligate Geo. IV. clung to what he fancied his duty under that.

"These Judicial tribunals, says Mr. Spooner, cannot, by accepting office under a Government, rid themselves of the paramount obligation that all men are under to declare, if they declare anything, that justice is law."

"If they declare anything," that is a very significant "if." Was there a lurking doubt in the writer's mind whether Judges had a right to "declare anything" in such circumstances? If there was let him cherish it. True, such Judges cannot rid themselves, as men, of the paramount obligation to declare, if they declare anything, that justice is law. But it is as men, as simple individuals, units in the sight of God, that this "paramount obligation" rests upon them. God knows them not as Judges. Their only "paramount obligation" as Judges, is to do what they agreed to do when they were made Judges, or quit the bench. God does not require of any of his creatures to juggle their fellows out of the gift of power, and then use that power contrary to their promises, in order to serve humanity. That were to ask "robbery for burnt offering."

But putting out of view this point of contract, between the people and their servants, we maintain that such a line of judicial duty is inconsistent with the existence of uniform and regular Government. It is the first step toward anarchy.

"Only what is just and right is law." Granted, but who is to decide what is just and right? We say that for the purpose of the civil government of any nation, the majority of that nation is to decide, and their decision is final, and constitutes for that nation law. Mr. Spooner thinks not; he thinks that each Judge is to decide for himself and act accordingly. We say that a uniform Government is impossible on this plan. "Statutes," says Webster, are but recommendations, if each man is to construe them as he pleases. "Quot homines, tot sententiae," (many men many minds.) Law would be one thing in Maine and another thing in Maryland—one thing to-day, another thing to-morrow. And each day and each Court would think itself infallibly right. "Orthodoxy is my doxy," said the English Bishop. "By right reason," says Attorney, every one would be willing to mean his own. "Discourses about Natural Law," says another eminent writer, "are the fullest of mistakes and most liable to error." Let us look at it. In these United States some think that neither men nor nations have the right to make war—to take life by the galleys—to authorize the holding of the soil as individual property—to deprive women from the right of voting. One not inconsiderable sect holds that the magistrate should enforce theological orthodoxy. Will Mr. Spooner inform us on his principle what is law on each of these points; and also what a Judge in such case is to pronounce? He will not, of course, maintain that a principle is right merely because the majority entertain it. A vote-receiver is sitting at the ballot-box; a woman appears and offers him a vote. His own opinion is that natural law, "the rule of natural justice," obliges him to receive it. The majority have told him, by specific statute, to receive the votes of men only. Which way is he to act?

All remittances to be made, and all letters relating to the pecuniary affairs of the paper, to be addressed (post paid) to the General Agent. Communications intended for insertion to be addressed to the Editors.

TERMS:—\$1.50 per annum, or \$1.75 (invariably required) if not paid within six months of the time of subscribing. ADVERTISEMENTS making less than a square inserted three times for 75 cents—one square \$1.

Printed for the Publishing Committee by G. N. HAPGOOD.

Which is "law" to him? A Judge is sitting on the bench—the jury find the prisoner guilty of murder. His own opinion is that no Government has a right to take life—the majority have ordered him, by specific statute, in such case made and provided, to doom the culprit to the gallows. How is he to act? Which is "law" to him? We say to him, quit the bench rather than violate your conscience. Mr. Spooner instructs him that all laws inconsistent with natural justice are void, and that he is bound to stay there and declare them so. Accordingly as every man's own conscience is, for the time being, his highest and holiest guide, he must set up his own idea of right; and as of old, every man's foot rule was regulated by the length of the reigning King's foot, so now Judges are to reverse the advice of Lord Coke and "be guided by the crooked cord of discretion, and not by the golden metwand (yard-stick) of the law."

Cicero, the heathen, maintains that for a merchant in time of famine to conceal the fact that a plenty of grain will come to-morrow, and thus grid a high price to-day out of the starving people, is contrary to "natural justice." Paley, the Christian, thinks such conduct right. If such a sale is brought before Mr. Spooner, to be enforced, which way will he decide? What is law? This eternal, unalterable, unmistakable law, he so much praises.

Gerrit Smith thinks the three-fifths slave basis an Anti-Slavery provision, "a bounty on liberty—an attempt to promote the Anti-Slavery cause." Mr. Spooner thinks just the reverse. Which way shall the poor Judge, in search of natural law, interpret the clause? Incidit in Scyllam cupiens vitare Charybdis.

If he steers clear of Spooner one way, he is sure to run foul of Smith the other. How grateful will he be to the author for getting him clear of the "old chaos of conflicting edicts," and introducing him to such a "natural, unalterable, universal, simple, intelligible principle," which supercedes all other law, and "is necessarily the only law!"

If Mr. Spooner, to escape this dilemma, shall explain his principle to mean that a Judge is to decide, not according to his own individual idea of right, but the general sense of the age or nation in which he lives, we hardly care to dispute such a proposition with him—for it is of little practical importance; since in the words of its statute-book will each magistrate always find the best, if not the only evidence of what his nation thinks just and right. "The laws," says Aristotle, "are the morals of the State and the character of the whole people taken collectively." If Mr. Spooner should feel disposed to appeal from the decision of one nation to the general sense of Christendom, he will find that there never was a man, for which any Judge, desirous of supporting it, could find abundance of philosophers to uphold him in thinking it right; and surely Slavery at present, finds many such, both in Church and State. Hence, on either plan there could be no uniform and regular Government.

We shall conclude our discussion of this point by showing that the almost unanimous, if not unanimous voice of lawyers and judicial tribunals repudiates this power. Our extracts will be drawn from as many different sources as possible, because it has been a favorite course with Liberty party debaters and others to maintain that all acts of Parliament or of any legislative body, contrary to reason and justice are void, and that Judges may treat them as such—a proposition identical with Mr. Spooner's, and clearly not sound.

This doctrine is usually sustained by disconnected quotations from Blackstone, among which the following generally occupies the first place:

"This law of nature being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to it; and such of them as are valid, derive all their force, and all their authority mediately or immediately, from this original."—Blackstone, Vol. 1, p. 41.

It will be observed that Blackstone only asserts that bad laws are void, without touching the question of the remedy in such case, or whether Judges may declare and treat them so. His able commentator, Prof. Christian, in a note on this passage, discusses this point, and decisively rejects the doctrine. He says:

"If an act of Parliament should, like the edict of Herod, command all children under a certain age to be slain, the Judge ought to resign his office rather than be auxiliary to its execution; but it could only be declared void by the same legislative power by which it was ordained."

With this, the other commentators, Chitty and the rest agree. Sedgwick unites with them in the same opinion. Woodeson, Blackstone's second successor in his professional chair, adds his assent in these words:

"We cannot expect that all acts of legislators will be ethically perfect; but if their proceedings are to be decided upon by their subjects, Government and subordination cease."—Chitty's Blackstone note, p. 41.—Wood El. Jur. 48.

Blackstone himself, in a subsequent page of his work, distinctly denies the doctrine which some might infer from the general terms he has used above. On the 21st page of his volume, he says:

"I know it is generally laid down more largely, that acts of Parliament, contrary to reason, are void. But if the Parliament will positively enact a thing to be done which is unreasonable, I know of no power, in the ordinary forms of the Constitution, that is vested with authority to control it; and the examples usually adduced in support of this sense of the rule, do none of them prove, that, where the main object of a statute is unreasonable, the Judges are at liberty to reject it; for that were to set the judicial power above that of the Legislature, which would be subversive of all Government."

... If we could conceive it possible for the Parliament to enact that a man should try as well his own causes as those of other persons, there is no court that has power to defeat the intent of the Legislature, when couched in such evident and express words, as leave no doubt whether it was the intent of the Legislature or not."

Chancellor Kent, also, of New York, the highest living authority, though citing and praising the few old cases which sustain a different doctrine, concludes with Blackstone, thus:—

"It is a principle in the English law, that an act of Parliament, delivered in clear and intelligible terms, cannot be questioned, or its authority controlled in any court of justice. When it is said in the books that a statute contrary to natural equity and reason or repugnant or impossible to be performed, is void, the cases are understood to mean that the courts are to give the statute a reasonable construction. They will not readily presume, out of respect and duty to the lawgiver, that any very unjust or absurd consequence was within the contemplation of the law. But if it should happen to be too palpable in its direction to admit of but one construction, there is no doubt in the English law, as to the binding efficacy of the statute. The will of the Legislature is the supreme law of the land, and demands perfect obedience."—Kent's Comm. 1. 447.

Locke lays down the same principle substantially when he says: "In all cases where the Government exists, the Legislature must be supreme. When that transgresses its bounds, the right of revolution begins." And Paley also:

"There necessarily exists in every Government a power, from which the Constitution has provided no appeal, absolute, omnipotent, uncontrollable, arbitrary, despotic. This person or assembly is the supreme power of the State. * * * the Legislature of the State."—Mor. & Pol. Phil. ch. 6.

Says the United States Circuit Court: "We cannot declare a legislative act void because it conflicts with our opinions of policy, expediency, or justice."

The remedy for unwise or oppressive legislation, within constitutional bounds, is by an appeal to the justice and patriotism of the representatives of the people. If this fails, the people in their sovereign capacity can correct the evil; but courts cannot assume their rights."

That would submit laws to a test as fallible and uncertain as all rules must be, which have not their source in some certain and definite standard, which varies neither with times, circumstances or opinions."

There is no paramount and supreme law which defines the law of nature, or settles these great principles of legislation, which are said by lawyers to control State Legislatures, in the exercise of the powers conferred on them by the people in the Constitution."

If it is once admitted that there exists in this Court a power to declare a State law void, which conflicts with no Constitutional provision, if we assume the right to annul them for their supposed injustice, or oppressive operation, we become the makers and not the expounders of Constitutions. Our opinions will not be a judgment on what was the pre-existing law of the case, but on what it is after we shall have so amended and modified it as to meet our ideas of justice, policy, and wise legislation, by a direct usurpation of legislative powers, and a flagrant violation of the duty enjoined on us by the Judiciary act.—1 Baldwin C. C. R. 74.

Mr. Justice Ireland, of the Supreme Court of the United States says:

"Some speculative jurists have held that a legislative act against natural justice, in itself, is void, but I cannot think that under such a Government, (as that of England,) any court of justice would possess power to declare it so."

After quoting Blackstone to sustain that position, he adds:

"If any act of Congress violates Constitutional provisions, it is void: * * * If, on the other hand, the Legislature of the Union, or any member of the Union, shall pass a law within the general scope of their Constitutional power, the courts cannot pronounce it to be void merely because it is, in their judgment, contrary to the principles of natural justice. The ideas of natural justice are regulated by no fixed standard; the abstract and pure may have differed upon the subject."—3 Dallas Rep. 399.

If the Legislature should pass a law in plain, unequivocal and explicit terms, within the scope of their Constitutional powers, I know of no authority in this Government to pronounce such an act void, merely because, in the opinion of the judicial tribunals, it was contrary to the principles of natural justice. For this would be vesting in the court legislative powers which might be abused, and would necessarily lead to collision between the legislative and judicial departments, dangerous to the well-being of society, or, at least, not in harmony with the structure of our free government. Justice is regulated by no certain or fixed standard, so that the abstract and pure might sometimes differ with respect to it. * * * Necessary dispensations with general principles. The Legislatures must be the judges when that necessity exists.—3 Rawle (Pennsylvania) Reports, 574.

The Supreme Court of the United States affirm the same doctrine, in a sentence which Mr. Spenser makes the cornerstone of his book:

"Where rights are infringed, where fundamental principles are overthrown, where the general system of the law is departed from, the legislative intention must be expressed with unmistakable clearness, to induce the Court of Justice to suppose a design to effect such objects."—(United States vs. Fisher et al. 9 Cranch, 390.)

"This language of the Supreme Court, (says Mr. Spenser,) admits, 1st, that the preservation of men's rights is the vital principle of law, and 2d, that courts (and the Supreme Court of the United States in particular,) will trample upon that principle at the bidding of the Legislature, when the mandate comes in the shape of a statute of such 'irresistible clearness,' that its meaning cannot be evaded."

Lord Mansfield recognizes the same principle in the sentence, which forms the other bulwark of Mr. Spenser's argument. In the 'Somerset' case, Lord Mansfield said, speaking of the acknowledged sin of slavery:

"So high an act of dominion must be recognized by the law of the country where it

is used. * * * The state of slavery is of such a nature, that it is incapable of being introduced on any reasons, moral or political—but only positive law, which preserves its force long after the reasons, occasion, and time itself from whence it was created, is erased from the memory. It is so odious that nothing can be suffered to support it but positive law."

Positive law, then, can so establish even Slavery, that even courts must treat it as legal.

The same doctrine shines out in all the cases, either on this side the ocean or in England, in which the slave trade has been brought in question. Certainly here would be a case in which, if anywhere, a Judge would use the power, if he had it, to treat bad laws as void. Still, no Judge, whatever his private opinions, has usurped the right to overrule the law of nations, which holds that trade to be lawful. Sir Wm. Scott, one of the highest, if not highest authority among recent English Judges in his department, holds the following language, in a case where the question of that trade was before him, and in which he decided that the slave trade was not a crime by the law of nations:

"I must remember that in discussing this question, I must consider it not according to any private moral apprehensions of my own, (if I entertained them ever so sincerely,) but as the law considers it. * * * An act must be LEGALLY criminal, because neither this court or any other can carry its private apprehensions, independent of law, into its public judgments, on the quality of actions. It must conform to the judgment of the law upon that subject; it cannot attribute criminality to an act where the law imputes none. It must look to the legal standard of morality on a question of this nature."—2 Dodson, Adm. Rep. 247.

Chief Justice Marshall says, in a similar case:

"That it (the slave trade) is contrary to the law of nature, will scarcely be denied. * * * Whatever might be the answer of a moralist to this question, a jurist must seek its legal solution in those principles of action which are sanctioned by the usages, the national acts, and the general assent of the world, of which he considers himself a part. * * * A jurist could not say that a practice thus supported was illegal."—Antelope 10, Wheaton 66.

See also Lord Mansfield 1. T. R. 313; Judge Story 1. Gall. 66; Judges Best and Taylor 3. B. & A. 353; C. I. Herle temp. Edw. 3. Darris 613; Lord Harwick, Darris 783; C. J. Shaw in the "Med Case," 18 Pick. Rep. 193.

I know that there are a few early cases, and a few rash assertions of Lord Coke, plausible perhaps in a Government like the English, where, as there exists no written Constitution, it might possibly be argued that the courts had a right to bring all laws to the test of those great principles of common sense and common justice, which form the only thing that can be called a foundation for British law. But here we have a specific, definite, written Constitution. It contains ALL the principles which the people, the nation, have agreed shall form the foundation of our national law. The only test, therefore, to which our courts have any right to submit the action of the Legislature is, to ask, is it Constitutional? If so, it is legally binding on them—no matter how unjust or how unreasonable it is. Such is the framework of Government under which we live.

But of even this assertion of Coke, Lord Chancellor Ellesmere, his contemporary, has remarked that it is,

"A paradox which derogates much from the wisdom and power of Parliament, that when the three estates, King, Lords, and Commons, have spent their labor in making a law, three Judges on a bench, shall destroy and prostrate their pains, advancing the reason of a particular court above the judgment of all the realm. Besides, more temperately did that reverend Chief Justice Herle, temp. El. III. deliver his opinion, cited by Coke, 8 R. 118, when he said some acts of Parliament are made against law and right, which may stand some times, prevailing, would not put them into execution, for it is a magis congruum (more proper) that acts of Parliament should be corrected by the same pen that drew them, than be dashed to pieces by opinion of a few Judges."—Quoted by Darris, 643.

And further still, Lord Coke qualifies the general language he had used when he elsewhere holds:

"That Judges are not to be encouraged to direct their conduct by the crooked cord of discretion, but by the golden metwand of the law; that is, not to construe statutes by equality, but to collect the sense of the Legislature by a sound interpretation of its language according to reason and grammatical correctness, and to be controlled by the common law."—Darris on Statutes, p. 615, 703.

Darris, a learned and distinguished writer, in his late able work on 'Statutes,' sums up the matter thus:

"The general and received doctrine certainly is, that an act of Parliament, of which the terms are explicit and the meaning plain, cannot be questioned, or its authority controlled in any Court of Justice," and "where the meaning is plain to regard consequences in the interpretation would be assuming legislative authority."

For Judges to mould statutes according to their sense of right, would suppose the Legislature,

"To have abdicated its functions and delegated its power and duties to the Judges."—pp. 616, 720, 755.

To deny the reader one moment longer with the example of another nation, let us add that the French law, generally considered much more loose on this point of judicial duty, is substantially the same with what we have been quoting. It allows the Bench to consult equity and use its individual discretion only on those points where the law is silent.

"Si l'on marque de loi il faut consulter l'usage ou l'équité. L'équité est le retour à la loi naturelle, dans le silence, l'opposition ou l'obscurité des lois positives."

Le pouvoir judiciaire établi pour appliquer les lois, a besoin d'être dirigé dans cette application par certaines règles. Elles sont telles que la raison particulière d'aucun homme ne puisse jamais prévaloir sur la loi, raison publique."

(Where there is no law, consult custom or equity. Equity is the return to natural law in case of the silence, self-contradiction or obscurity of statutes. Judges appointed to obey the laws, must be guided by fixed rules.

These are such that the conscience of an individual can never be allowed to overrule the law, which is the national conscience.)—Quoted by Darris, p. 787, 8.

Are we not, then, borne out in our assertion that neither any practical theory of Government nor the recorded opinions of Statists or Jurists countenance the doctrine of this essay, that Judges are proper persons to remedy, by overruling, the bad laws of a State? On the contrary, all combine to point us to the duty of submission, or to the ultimate and extreme right of Revolution, as the appropriate course in the circumstances; and allow the Judge no choice but to apply the laws, as they are handed him by the Supreme Power, or to vacate his seat.

Indeed the most famous definition of Civil Liberty makes it consist in the "being governed only by KNOWN, FIRM, CONSTITUTED, INFLEXIBLE RULES. What becomes of this if the decisions of the Court are to vary as fast as the moral sense of the Bench rises higher and higher in its perception of right and wrong. On this plan justice becomes as much 'matter of accident' as Madame de Stael told Alexander safety was under a despotism. To Mr. Spenser's doctrine we may apply what was said on another occasion:

"If these principles prevail there are no longer any Pyrenees. Every bulwark and barrier of the Constitution is broken down; it becomes tabula rasa, carte blanche, for every one to scribble on what he pleases."

W. P.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

COMMUNICATIONS.

CHESTER, Georgia County, Ohio, }
March 2, 1847. }

MR. JONES:—

Sir—Your paper containing your answer to my objections was received; but having to leave home for some time, and the pressure of other duties has prevented my noticing your answer until now. I did not intend, when I presented my objections to sustaining your paper, to enter into any controversy with you, nor do I now intend to do it; but as my objections were barely named, perhaps it is my duty to present them more fully, and in so doing, I may correct you in some of your misunderstandings, and convince you of your error in reasoning.

In reply to objection 1st, you reason from the example of Christ, and this I understand to be your argument—it is based upon a supposed analogy existing between the circumstances under which Christ lived and labored, and those in which we live.—1st, Christ lived under a government where slavery existed; so do we. 2d, Christ labored for its removal; so do we. Now for your argument.

1. Whatever remedy Christ employed for the removal of slavery, is the only proper remedy for us to employ.

2. Christ employed as a remedy moral suasion only.

3. Therefore moral suasion is the only proper remedy for us to employ.

Or 1. Whatever Christ did not apply as a remedy for the removal of slavery we may not consistently apply.

2. Christ did not apply political action as a remedy.

3. Therefore we may not consistently do it.

Did you not know when you drew up this argument that it was mere sophistry? Do you not know that we live under a Republican form of Government, which the People may mould and shape as they please, by the spreading of truth and the exercise of the right of suffrage? Christ and the Apostles lived where they could not exercise the right of suffrage—they were mere tributaries of the King of Rome. Will you say that we are tributaries to some King, and, therefore, cannot exercise the right of suffrage? (1) Let me apply your argument a little farther.—Christ did not teach the doctrine of seceding from the Government as the remedy for the removal of slavery. Therefore we should not. They did not refuse to follow Christ because he would not carry his opposition to slavery to the ballot-box; they knew he could not do. But they did get offended at him because he would not secede from the Government of Rome, and set up one of his own. (2) Let me give you one more argument drawn from the same source.

1. To voluntarily contribute of our money for the support of a Government, that, in any way, tolerates or gives its support to slavery, is to involve ourselves in the sin of slavery.

2. Christ voluntarily contributed to the support of the Roman Government. (See Matt. 23 ch. 23 v.—"Pay tribute to him and Peter.")

3. Therefore Christ was guilty of the sin of seceding.

But Christ did not sin. Therefore we may voluntarily give our support to a Government, that, in some respects, has given its support to slavery, whilst we are doing, to the extent of our powers, for the rectifying of its evils, and not be responsible for those wrongs. I thank you, Friend Jones, for this argument; but surely all this could not have been a mere blunder. It becomes a serpent to your theory, whilst yet in your hands. (3) When you mounted the Irishman's horse, with one spur, to ride out of your difficulty and convince me of my error, surely you must have mounted the wrong horse. The peculiar features of his horse was, it went both sides together; but you have long pulled your one spur of moral suasion, and, not using but the one, the right of political action has not, as yet, been after following.—Now, Friend Jones, just put on the other

spur, or get on to our Liberty horse, for he goes both sides together. Have you never heard of the man that got into the boat, and concluded to use but one oar, thinking the other side would be after following; but behold the side without the oar would neither go forward, nor let the other, but pulled it round and round. Please take the other oar and then you may move forward both sides together.

As for the Constitutional question, I shall not discuss it now. Yours is a work of annihilation—ours of reform, where reform may be needed. And, to say the least, when there is a sufficient amount of public opinion and political power to dissolve the Union, and maintain our refusal to submit to the present Government, there will then be power sufficient to reform when reform may be needed.

You ask to whom my views of secession are designed to apply. I answer to all who have properly become members of this Government, either by birth or the oath of naturalization. The question is not whether a man may secede in any way or not; nor whether I may go from the fellowship, communion or association of some church or body of men; but can a person secede from a Government and neither go from its territory nor control? To affirm that he can, is to say a thing may be and not be, at the same time—a positive contradiction of terms. Do you refer to any Lexicon, either ancient or modern? No—this would be fatal to your theory. As for your piratical government, if you secede you may go to the moon, or some other planet; or forcibly resist and maintain a government of your own; or faithfully obey the Divine law and meekly endure the penalties attached to the violation of all wicked laws; but whether your submission is voluntary or forced it is no secession. Christ's instruction was, "Go teach my Gospel; hold forth the principles therein contained; fearlessly obey the Divine law, and meekly endure all the penalties that may fall on you for so doing."

Your 2d argument in favor of your views of secession is drawn from the Church of England.

1. If a man can secede from the Church of England, and not go from its territory or control, then a man may secede from our Government and not go from its territory or control.

2. A man may secede from the Church of England, &c.

3. Therefore he may secede from civil government and not go from its territory or control.

This is logic with a vengeance; a begging of the question; assuming the very point to be proved. Your argument is built on an identity existing between the government of that Church and civil government. This point of identity you define to be in the exercise of power to collect their revenue.—You say, "they mutually assist each other." That is, they are married together, and are one so far as the levying and enforcing the collection of taxes for their support is concerned. What now is your argument drawn from the Church of England? A man may secede from the Government of England.—Therefore a man may secede from Government. This is pretty hard begging.

You surely have much to do yet to explain how a man may go from a thing and yet remain in it. I affirm, fearless of successful controversy, that if one who is now a member to remain in the territory and be controlled by its laws, is not to be still a member of the Government, then there are no members, and consequently none to secede. (4)

I did not speak of bloodshed, anarchy and ruin as the result of emancipation, or as coming from the slaves. I said "men do not relinquish power voluntarily." The power is now wielded by the oppressor, and he will not voluntarily relinquish it. He cares not how soon you go from his territory, nor how long you stay upon it, so that you yield to his control; he will compel you to give him his support, as he does this day every Garrisonian in the United States, though they have talked long and loud of having seceded from the Government. But, sir, let them attempt to resist him, and maintain their secession from the support of Government in the payment of taxes, and see if blood shed would not follow. And when you had dissolved the present national Government in blood, do you think its scattered fragments could be collected and formed into one Government that would be righteous according to Mr. and Mrs. Foster's view of what would constitute a righteous Government? No, sir, you cannot, with the utmost stretch of fancy, dream of such a result. Anarchy and ruin would prevail. And would the mingling of the blood and tears of the white with the ocean flowing from the poor bondman, change its crimson hue? No, sir, your doctrine of secession is no non-resistant remedy.

In reply to my 3d objection, you first charge me with being mistaken, and then you afterwards virtually admit what you previously deny. Here is your argument:

1. All anti-slavery men who are supporters of this Government or members of pro-slavery Churches are so far from doing any anti-slavery work that their baneful influence "more than counterbalances their influence against slavery."

2. All are supporters of the Government or members of pro-slavery Churches who do not secede and become Garrisonians.

3. Therefore none do any anti-slavery work but Garrisonians.

Don't be afraid of your own argument—speak it right out. But, once more, let me make use of your last argument.

1. The supporter of this Government "not only weakens the force of his word or deed, but more than counterbalances its influence."

2. All Garrisonians support this Government by paying taxes and voluntarily patronizing the Post Office.

3. Therefore they do no anti-slavery work according to your own showing. (4)

I now present a fifth reason for discontinuing your paper:

For giving place in your paper to communications that are infidel in their language and influence. Such is the one in rhyme from Wm. Hick. Though I utterly condemn the connection of the M. E. Church with slavery, yet I view that communication as coming from one whose heart is at war with special efforts put forth to bring souls to Christ. (6)

D. H. MILLER.

(1) We suppose our correspondent believes that Christ was God made manifest in the flesh, and that one of the objects of his mission was to present to man a practical exhibition of the means by which truth could be best established. If it could best be done by a union of political action with moral suasion, then, instead of Jesus being the Carpenter's son, born in a Bethlehem manger, his birth would have been heralded from the mightiest palace of all the Roman Empire as the future ruler of the realm. But inasmuch as Truth depends not upon political power, he who was sent as the embodiment of All Truth, was one who possessed no worldly authority, and needed it not for the accomplishment of his mission. Our correspondent thinks that Christ did not use political power because he could not, because he did not possess it. It would be more in conformity with the philosophy Jesus taught, and the truths that he practised, to say that he did not possess it because it would detract from his moral greatness and weaken his moral power. The character of Jesus would have lost much of its simple, child-like nature if he had entered the political arena and mingled in the strife of parties. If, however, political power was necessary for the establishment of Truth, or even desirable, does not our correspondent believe that Christ would have possessed all that was needed, and have exercised it?

(2) We deny that Christ was a member of the government of Rome. It is true he came from a people who were, in a measure, subject to her laws, because they were a tributary nation. Until we received this epistle we were under the impression that Christ had set up a government of his own, not, it is true, after the fashion of the corrupt kingdoms of this earth, else would his Disciples have fought, but a spiritual kingdom, upon which was written "No union with slaveholders, or other workers of iniquity," a sentiment which is entirely too orthodox and too ultra for D. H. M. to adopt. The government of Rome was a fighting and tyrannical government, and the conversion of any of its members to Christianity, was in fact a conversion of them out of its fighting and tyrannical spirit, although they might continue to retain their nominal connection. Besides, the government of Rome did not require its members to swear to do certain specified acts of wickedness as this government does. It exacted a general oath of allegiance, similar in its character to the promise contained in the marriage ritual of some sects, that the wife shall obey the husband. And by this, no one understands that she is to obey him if he commands her to do wrong.

And finally, the subjects of Herod—the members of the Jewish government, were not, properly speaking, members of the Roman government. Judea had its king, its laws, its institutions; but, like the Dissenters who pay tribute to the American government because of compulsion, it paid tribute to the government of Rome; and as, because of its weakness, it could not do otherwise, it suffered an officer, bearing the title of Governor, to be appointed by the Emperor, and to reside within its territory to see that the conditions it was compelled to make were faithfully observed.

(3) D. H. M. may call this our argument, but we decline the honor he would confer upon us, and would much prefer that he should himself father his most lame and impotent conclusion. We freely admit that the Dissenters pay tribute as Christ did. Our correspondent is not content with this, but goes and becomes a part of the government that exacts it of them, and swears to uphold it in all its oppressive and pro-slavery enactments; and when rebuked for so doing, when his inconsistency is pointed out to him, he asks, in justification, "Did not Jesus pay tribute?" Had he lived eighteen hundred years ago and possessed the elective franchise and acted upon the same principle he now does, although he might have voted against Pontius Pilate, he would have consented to his inauguration provided he had received more votes than a candidate who would not have consented to the crucifixion of Jesus.

(4) Here are a good many assertions spread over a considerable space. As we had written an article on "Reciprocity" which will be found in another column—before we read the above, we will let that go

for a reply to this portion of the epistle.—We suspect, however, that the writer of it will not be satisfied, for we think nothing in reason can satisfy a man who is not able to see any difference between leaving a government, and leaving a country where that government exists.

(5) D. H. M. is exceedingly careless in stating our positions and making arguments for us, though, to do him justice, he makes our argument—so he calls it—about as good as his own. These two arguments, as he chooses to term them, are based upon the same expression which he misquotes and misrepresents. The language we used was this:—

"Every one who speaks an anti-slavery thought or does an anti-slavery act, so far forth does service to the cause; but if his position be inconsistent, if he be a supporter of this government, or a member of a pro-slavery church, he may thereby not only weaken the force of his word or deed, but more than counterbalance its influence."

It is doubtless very easy to take the tag end of a sentence, and by detaching it from its original connection, make it mean something entirely different from what the writer designed to express, but we do not think it very honest so to do. In this way Atheism may be proved true from the Bible. All you have to do is to omit the words "The fool hath said in his heart," and quote the concluding part of the passage "There is no God." If D. H. M. sends us another communication, we hope he will be more truthful.

(6) If we rejected all communications that were infidel in their character—infidel to the truths of God and the rights of man—we most certainly would never have given place to D. H. Miller's, for its design and tendency is to make men satisfied to remain in a pro-slavery church, and to continue members of this God-defying government. Although the writer does not represent Paul as a slave-catcher, yet he does what is quite as bad—makes Jesus Christ endorse the character of the American government as one in which Christians may consistently take part.

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

SALEM, APRIL 2, 1847.

"I love agitation when there is cause for it—the alarm bell which startles the inhabitants of a city, saves them from being burned in their beds."—Edmund Burke.

Persons having business connected with the paper, will please call on James Barnaby, corner of Main and Chesnut sts.

Special Notice.

The treasury of the Western Anti-Slavery Society is in immediate need of about one hundred dollars. Will those who have made pledges, oblige by forwarding the amount if convenient? If those who have neither made pledges nor given anything to the funds of the Society are disposed to contribute, will they please do so at once?

All the money forwarded will be acknowledged in the Bugle.

SAM'L BROOKE, Gen. Agent.

RECIPROCITY.

We do not know of a single just relation existing among men, or which claims to be just, which is not based upon reciprocal duties. The child opens its eyes upon existence and claims protection and support, not as a matter of charity, but on the ground of right. The parents acknowledge their duty to provide for its wants and care for its comforts; and out of this newly created relation springs duties which it is bound to perform as soon as the development of its powers enable it to do so. The duties of master and apprentice are also reciprocal. The former is bound to instruct the latter "in the art, trade, and mystery" of his craft; and the latter, to serve faithfully the term of his apprenticeship. The same is true of government, and its citizens or subjects. No matter how absolute is the despotism, it always admits—theoretically at least—that the duties of the parties are reciprocal; that while the ruler exacts allegiance from his subjects, he must strive by wise legislation to advance their interests and promote their happiness.

If the parents have never performed any of the duties of parents—for instance, thrown their babe upon the world as a foundling—the child is under no obligation to render them the love and obedience of a child. If a master should neglect to teach or cause his apprentice to be taught the trade he had contracted to instruct him in, the apprentice would be at liberty to decline performing his part of the contract, inasmuch as the consideration which was a condition in the terms has not been given him. If a Government should refuse to protect its citizens or subjects, the latter would have an undoubted right to withdraw, or transfer their allegiance.

It is true, there are those who so little understand the nature of these relations as to suppose that the stranger parties may, if they choose, repudiate their part of the obligation, and yet rightfully compel the others to perform those duties, which in reality have no existence except as reciprocal duties. Against this doctrine we most earnestly protest, and claim in the name of equal and exact justice, that if parents have a right to cast off their children who refuse to perform the duties of children, children have a right to

dissolve their connection with parents who refuse to perform the duty of parents; that if the master has a right to discharge his apprentices who will not serve him with fidelity, apprentices have a right to leave the master who will not do his duty by them; if governments have a right to disown such of their citizens as fail in promised allegiance, the citizens or subjects have a right to repudiate the governments which fail to secure to them their rights—the object for which governments are, or should be, established among men.—This certainly is no more than just and reasonable, if, as is generally admitted in the abstract, the obligations resting upon the parties in the relations named, are equally binding upon both and grow out of reciprocal duties.

It has often been asserted by the opponents of Disunion doctrines, that no member of the U. S. Government can possibly cease to become a citizen of it by his own act, and most certainly not if he remains upon its soil. The points we here wish to present for consideration are these: (1.) If the U. S. Government claims a right to excommunicate one of its members because he violates regulations, the violation of which involves no deviation from principle, has not the individual a right to repudiate that government if it fails to secure the ends for which all just governments are established, and becomes oppressive in its acts and criminal in its character? (2.) If the U. S. Government can excommunicate a citizen while residing upon its soil, may it not be practicable for a citizen to repudiate the government without leaving the country?

It would seem to be unnecessary to attempt to argue this, especially when we remember that the government professes to have no other power save that which is delegated to it by the people; and if the aggregate has the delegated power to excommunicate one, we should think the one possessed the original power to excommunicate the aggregate. Now for a Constitutional fact to show that the position of the Disunionists in this respect is tenable. The 13th article in the amendments of the U. S. Constitution reads thus:—

"If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive or retain, any title of nobility or honor, or shall, without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them."

Now is any one so silly as to believe that although the government claims the right to deprive of citizenship the man, who without humbly asking the consent of Congress, retains the snuff-box with which Louis Philippe presents him as a testimony of his remembrance of the kindness he received at his hands when an exile in America, that that man has no right to withdraw his allegiance from a government that is crushing millions of his brethren, and trampling even upon his own rights? We can hardly credit it. It will be observed too, that the government does not think it necessary to expel a man from the country in order to disfranchise him, but it is done on the soil.

We think this amendment is sufficient to convince at least every one who believes that the rights of the individual are not wholly absorbed when he becomes a member of a republican government, that inasmuch as the government claims a right to repudiate him, he has an equal right to repudiate the government; and as the government can do it without driving him from its territory, so he can do it without leaving his native land.

The Cincinnati Herald again.

The editor of the Cincinnati Herald appears to take it very unkindly that we refused him for advertising in his editorial columns, that certain persons had opened a recruiting office where volunteers for the Mexican war would be received; and is so excited in consequence that he forgets to tell his readers that we not only published all he requested in relation to "The Ohio Volunteers &c.," but twice as much, and then—to prove, we suppose, that he has done just right in relation to the war—insinuates that many of our readers as well as ourselves, are fools.—We shall not complain so far as we are concerned, for we are content to be called fools so long as no word or deed of ours can be construed into a sanction of the butchery of Mexicans, or—no may add—of gambling!

In the very No. of the Herald in which he so courteously notices us is an article from the pen of his reporting editor—for which of course, the principal is responsible—headed "A RAFFLE," the substance of which is, that four pictures by Mrs. Spencer are to be raffled for. In it occasion is taken to say, "we hope that the raffling will not need to wait long before the tickets will all be taken."

It may be an evidence of foolishness on our part to say anything amiss in this approval of an aristocratic mode of gambling as the Raffle, but certain old fashioned notions that we long since imbibed, cause us so to sympathize with Green, in his anti-gambling reform, that the commendation even of a Raffle, though coming as this does through the columns of a Liberty party paper, is repulsive to our sense of moral right.

NOBLE DEED.—Gerrit Smith has made a donation of \$2000 for the use of the starving Irish—a larger sum than has been given by any other person in this country.

New Post Office Regulations.

Congress has been amusing itself, among other things, with tinkering the Post Office regulations, and has enacted rules, some of which are exceedingly anti-democratic, and some only perfectly silly. Three or four of these will especially interest our readers.—

(1.) That portion of the law of '45 which allows papers to go free to subscribers within thirty miles of their place of publication, is repealed. If this should cause any of our patrons to discontinue their papers, we cannot do otherwise than come to the conclusion that their interest in it is less than that of the hundreds who have been paying postage on it ever since its commencement. (2.) All transient newspapers—newspapers not sent to subscribers from the publishers, and all handbills and circulars not exceeding one sheet, will be charged with three cents postage, to be paid at the time of depositing them in the office. This is certainly unjust taxation. Here, for instance is a man who takes a paper, the postage of which costs him fifty cents per year; after reading it, he wishes to send it to a brother one hundred miles distant, who is too poor to subscribe, although he can afford to pay the postage on it, but the new regulation steps in and says to the subscriber, "you must pay three cents for every copy of the paper you send your brother."

This provision may perhaps eventually operate to increase the subscription lists of newspapers, but be that as it may, it is oppressive on the people and will necessarily retard the general diffusion of newspaper intelligence by limiting the circulation of copies which have hitherto passed through many hands.— (3.) All persons belonging to the army in Mexico are to receive letters, packages, and papers not exceeding 10c. in weight, free, during the war and three months after its termination. Those who stay at home and bless mankind by their labors, cannot send a newspaper to a friend without being taxed three cents, while those who are engaged in butchering Mexicans receive their papers, packages and letters free. (4.) Any person who sends two letters in the same envelope addressed to different individuals (unless designed for foreign countries) subjects himself to the penalty of \$10. How the Post Masters are to ascertain whether an envelope contains one or more letters is not specified, probably for the very sufficient reason that it would be difficult to point out a mode which would not render the prying official liable to a prosecution in the courts of law. We'll insure that the beast Balaam bestride was never guilty of so great a piece of absurdity. However we will not complain of this provision, and had the members of Congress been content to make fools only of themselves, as in this case, the action of the 29th Congress would have been far less reprehensible.

Affairs in Mexico.

There is great probability that a severe contest has taken place between the forces of Santa Anna and those of Gen. Taylor.—The former is reported to have had 25,000 men under his command, while the latter had but about one fifth of that number. The last authentic accounts from Taylor, represent him as being in a very critical position, as indeed appears to be the case with most of the detachments of the American army in Mexico—and this, of itself, would be sufficient to give Rumor an additional pair of wings. When we receive intelligence that we think may be relied upon, we will give it; but it seems hardly worth while to occupy our columns with an account of a "Great Battle at Saltillo," in which 4 or 5000 Mexicans and 2000 Americans were killed, while so little is known about the authenticity of the report.

There have been insurrections in New Mexico and California among the newly conquered citizens of those provinces, and some of the Americans in authority there have been massacred. This, however, is nothing more than should have been expected. Mexican citizens who have been compelled to adjure their own government and take an oath of allegiance proffered by their invaders, are not the right material to make the most loyal and peaceable subjects. These insurrections are probably but the beginning of the end, unless the constant presence of a standing army among them prevents further outbreaks.

Graham's April number has come to us in its beautiful dress, and laden with its usual variety. It contains two finely executed landscape engravings. One is a field of death—the battle ground of Saratoga where thundering cannon are belching forth their murderous contents and sweeping hundreds from the stage of life. There is represented dead and dying mortality, and living men whose entire thoughts are bent on human slaughter, and whose highest ambition is to murder their brothers. The other is a view of Pittsburgh. There flows the Monongahela and Allegheny, and there sweeps the widening tide of the Ohio whose waters are formed by a union of the twin. Boats ply to and fro, manufactories send forth their dense columns of smoke, and you can almost hear the busy hum of industry which comes up from the populous city. This is a scene where man's power is directed to create, that where his energies are expended to destroy.

Notice to Correspondents and Receipts are crowded out this week.

We have been requested to publish the proceedings of a meeting of "The Mechanics and Working Men's Association of Salem," held on Saturday evening last. As this is a local society and but a small portion of our readers will feel interested in its proceedings, we do not think it best to publish them.

We are frequently asked to give place in our columns to minutes of meetings of local Temperance Societies and others not Anti-Slavery, and have generally declined doing so. We have not acted thus owing to any lack of interest in the different branches of Reform; but from a conviction that the proceedings of local societies cannot be interesting to more than a few, comparatively, of our subscribers. We deem this explanation advisable in order that the working people of Salem, and others who have made similar requests may not infer from our not complying with their wishes, that we are unfavorable to their measures or objects.

Nearly six months since, we were directed to send some twenty copies of the Bugle to certain individuals with the hope that after having read it for half a year they would be disposed to continue to take it on their own account. The time for which their friends subscribed will expire with the 29th number—the 2nd paper after this. Those of them who do not wish to have it continued, will please notify us of the fact without delay. This can be done by telling his Post Master that he declines receiving it after the 6th of June, subscription expires, and requesting him to inform us of the same.

A Proposition.—Liberty party seems to be in considerable difficulty just now as to who shall be its Presidential nominee; some sections of it even advising that no nomination should be made. By way of helping it out of its quandary, we would propose to the party as a suitable candidate, the name of Colonel JOSEPH CILLEY, of New Hampshire, late U. S. Senator.

REVIEW OF SPOONER.—We have occupied a considerable part of our sheet this week with a review of Spooner's argument, on the Constitution, by Wendell Phillips, and we are certain that those of our readers who are interested in this question will thank us for it.

We find the following announcement from Wm. Lloyd Garrison in the Liberator of the 19th inst. The paper containing it came to hand too late for publication last week.

Visit to Ohio.

We have long been importuned, by our friends and coadjutors at the West, to make them a visit; but we have not yet been able to comply with their wishes. Our transatlantic tour, last summer, prevented us from going to Ohio at that time, as we had intended at an early period in the year. We now desire the editors of the Anti-Slavery Bugle to announce, that we purpose visiting that State as early as the ensuing first of August, and trust nothing will occur to prevent our carrying this purpose into effect. We shall calculate to spend the month of August in Ohio, but cannot prolong our visit more than four or five weeks.

For the Anti-Slavery Bugle. War and Warriors.

BY JOHN B. BEACH—NO. II.

"Oh brother, we must if possible resuscitate some soul and conscience in us."—CANTLEY.

I wish I could believe that all my readers are clear of the guilt of the present iniquitous war. But how can I, when I suspect that some of them may be partisans, whose watchword is "The Government right or wrong?" "The Government before Justice, Reason, Liberty or Law?"—The Government now, the Government forever? You are then interested in what I have to say. So also are those of you who have borne your manly testimony in favor of the right and the true, who by your votes and your voices have proved yourselves to be in very deed peace-makers, as well as theoretically peace men. How can it be otherwise, when war and tumult are breeding over the land of our dearest hopes? How can it be otherwise when the energies of your Legislatures are exhausted on schemes of foreign conquest, and rich treasures of your Government are heaped upon the altar of Mammon? How can it be otherwise when the broken throat of battle roars along your distant frontier, and your pseudo-country's voice is calling fathers, sons and brothers to fields of unholly conflict?

Oh! reader, this fierce spirit has come up again from the pit;—best pleased

"With the war's clamor and the groan of death."

All deaf to human prayer it has stalked through your quiet streets, thirsting for precious blood. It has summoned brothers from the tender embrace of sisterly love, to breast the bayonet and the cannon; the summons have been obeyed, and their young blood now mingles with the soil of Mexican plains. It has called on fathers to tear themselves from the domestic altar where their holiest affections cluster and their purest devotions are paid, march into a distant clime, sunder the tender ties of human brotherhood, and sheath their ancestral swords hilt deep in the bowels of their fellows: the stern call has been heard, and the response was given when the red hot guns of Ringgold's flying battalion poured an incessant sheet of flame and promiscuous death upon the tiger-like regiments of Tam-

pie. All this has been done and yet no voice of popular indignation has gone up into the halls of national legislation from the two millions of freemen that tread our noble State. All this has been done but no public rebuke, startling as the trump that rang through Sinai's mountain altitudes, has yet troubled the visage of that brazen-browed oppressor who usurps the curule chair of your revered Washington. By the government we have been accustomed to reverence—by the rules we have been taught to honor, deeds of public infamy have been performed, so numerous and so black, that if I had the tongue of a Tully, if my throat were iron and my lungs brass, and if I were to stun with piercing words the deaf walls of the Forum for many a day, I could not enumerate them all.—And yet our citizens maintain their imperturbable gravity, they still remain in their fields, their shops, their stores, their warehouses and their factories.

Mammon has literally stuffed their throats with gold, so that they cry "Taxes," "Tariffs," "Dollars and Dividends!" and that is all. Their lips are never heard pleading eloquently for God and the Right—not even when their brother's blood from the ground cries fearfully to Heaven for vengeance. The public Press is almost universally silent.—Under the rigorous censorship of party spirit, it dare not lift a note of warning or indignation. Most of our Editors (thank God, there are some noble exceptions) dare not believe that they have souls of their own, or that they possess the common prerogatives of manhood; how then shall they plead for the rights of humanity, against the influential and the great, or bow speak on behalf of Truth and Righteousness when these are trodden down in the streets? The church, too, is mute as a voiceless ruin! Although the terrible arm of unrighteous legislation is steadily loosening the very foundation stones upon which she rests, yet from within her stately walls issues no solemn voice of rebuke, planting terrors in the hearts of the mighty wicked. Whenever the popular mind becomes aroused by some new type of public villainy or shocked by some unprecedented display of unjust power, then her ministers instead of guiding this holy indignation into its proper channel, so that it may fall in one unbroken torrent upon the Godless heads of those who unscaled its direful fountains, may be heard crying "Peace! Peace! Ye troubled people! The powers that be are ordained of God." "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king as Supreme, or unto governors as unto them that are sent by him."

For the honor of God and our holy religion be it said, these remarks apply not to all.—Some churches there are which bear noble testimony to the essential wickedness of war—and many ministers there are, I trust, who proclaim with fearlessness the scorching truths of Revelation on this subject. God speed them and multiply their ranks a thousand fold—for moral heroes are the noblest and rarest productions of this time-serving age.

THE CHURCH.

The following extracts are from a report presented to the Hudson Liberty party convention by "Father Keep," on the relation of the American Church to Slavery, and its duty in relation thereto. They are well worthy of perusal, and with very slight exceptions, we can adopt the sentiments of the entire document.

A Church is any number of professed believers in Christ, associated for the purpose of inculcating the truths he taught, and maintaining the ordinances he appointed. Its spiritual elements are love to God and love to man. Its visible embodied elements are persons, in any given locality, dominated Christians, and in covenant with each other to publish the doctrines, and to follow the example of their common head and leader. All who thus publicly covenant, are recognized as the visible Church on earth. All such, likewise, not thus associated, who possess the spirit of Christ, who really love his teachings, and his character, doing his commandments and following his example, are truly his disciples, and recognized as members of the invisible church of Christ. Persons of this last description, whether or not members of any visible church organization, Christ calls his sheep, and connects with them the ever blessed fact, "My sheep hear my voice and I know them, and they follow me." Of all such, both associated and individually, he says, "Ye are the salt of the earth—ye are the light of the world."

Whatever else may perish from among men, the true Church of Christ will live. Within her precincts, alone, is the virgin soil on which civil and religious liberty can vegetate and become mighty, and send abroad its power to elevate nations, and to bless the race. Philosophy in her best days, and in her best robes, never gave birth to that charity which builds hospitals and provides for the poor and the oppressed; while such results, like the blossoms of Eden, lie thick and splendid, and levelly, along the wake of Christian enterprise. The true Church of Christ, by which is meant nothing less than an association of holy men, or real Christians, is Heaven's appointed agency, to remove from among men every description of moral evil.—And when she fills up the measure of her duty—when in the fulness of fact, she occupies the post assigned her, and carries out the great IDEA which lies at her foundation, then it is enough—the Church of meets the exigencies of the day and of the age, and becomes the almoner to the world the good God assigns for the race. In this position and with such activities, the Church becomes a "Do Right Society," and every other organization for reform may safely fall in as subordinate instrumentalities.

To the true Church, the faithful around the Cross, and at the feet of the blessed Saviour, suffering Humanity extends its tearful eye and imploring hands. Upon their ears the myriads of victims to ills of every name, and forming their complaints, are sure of sympathy, and are made glad by promises and by deeds for relief. Under the wing of her influence, no severity or repulsiveness to the needy is fostered. In his bosom of love, no wrong nestles; nor thought can dwell in favor of artificial distinctions among men—no class legislation—or monopolies—or irresponsible power—or idolatry of rank and wealth—or the sacrifice of the least right of any individual. In her vision, Man is a MAN, and every where treated as a Man.

To her, the American slave directs his imploring eye. Before her altars, and her throne of grace—amidst her solemn vows and sacred assurances, he clanks the galling chains which bind him. From her proceeds the reliable response, be of good cheer, the time for your release hastens; and when the influence of this association of good and holy men shall be judiciously concentrated, when they can utter the voice and lift the power of united counsels and efforts; and when no longer crippled by false connections, then shall the light of noon pour in upon the machinations of tyrants, and upon the whole area of human rights, like the culminating rays of the morning; and every blow for Emancipation shall tell like the onward tread of embattled legions. Such men are the true Church of Christ; they profess his spirit; they live at the fountain of divine truth; they habitually bathe in the pellucid ocean of humanity; they discern the right and follow it; and they have meekly studied the doctrines of human brotherhood till they have learned their own equality with their own mother's children. Through the influence of such, are all reformations from sin among men to be effected. And the blessed work will advance as they shall succeed in reforming the leaders of which many of them are still members, or come out from connections where their reformatory principles are smothered, and their zeal choked.

A religious organization assuming the name of a Church, is not, of course, to be recognized as the Church of Christ. The designation is merely nominal, if the body sustain or countenance immoral acts. Slavery, or the chattel principle, is, in and of itself, sinful. The body which sustains slavery, does, in fact, uphold a system of the most gross and revolting iniquity—a combination unsurpassed in wrong. Calling such a body the Church of Christ, does not make it so. If this body embrace pious men, they should understand that the body is essentially corrupt in their associated character, a mass of evil doers. The proof is that it comprises slaveholders, or sustains slaveholding. Subjugation on this point vanishes, and logic is dumb; the moment yourself is the slave, and subjected to the chains and the lash. To have Christian fellowship with a slaveholder, is a sin. Just so far as the Churches in the United States practice this fellowship, is the practical Christianity of the country corrupt—deeply, loathingly—but we hope not irretrievably. So long as the Churches occupy their present position, in reference to immoral acts, while the Pulpit is so partial, so destitute of moral courage, so unfaithful, so servile in counting the favor of men, they cannot reform the world, nor but partially claim the honor of being the world's benefactors; nor through them can deliverance ever be extended to the crushed slave.—While these Churches in their creeds, and in their covenants boldly condemn the wrong doer, he finds shelter under their wing, in almost every form of sin. And thus will it continue to be, till the Church demands that we live out the commands of Christ, who taught his disciples to love one another, even as he loved them, till there be Christ in the preaching, and Christ in the members.

The guilt of the Churches, and the recreancy of the pulpit in reference to slavery, exceeds conception. Since 1620, there has not been a year in which the united combination of the Church in this land, might not have given the death blow to slavery in it. The first purchase of slaves was made under her countenance. In 1776, fifty six years after the first purchase, four years after the decision of the highest English Court that slavery could not stand under British law, and when the Statesmen of the country had so far come into the light as to publish to the world the Declaration of Independence, the Church should have demanded that the noble act which sundered the bond which held the colonies to the British throne, should have also cut the chain which held the black man in slavery. But this duty she neglected.—Down to the present time, a period of seventy years, has the Church neglected her duty, and countenanced this atrocious iniquity.—She might have checked its progress at any stage during this period. Even now, the slave power would very soon die, if the Church should withhold from it support, pronounce slaveholding sinful, and exclude from her communion all who are siding in it.—But this duty the great mass of the Churches refuse to perform. They persist in holding a sustaining connection with it—they treat it as a favored sin—a pet—to condemn which, with a view to its certain and immediate overthrow, exposes to the frown and rebuke of the Church. In this course of apologizing for slaveholders, and sustaining the chattel principle, the Nation has lost its conscience on this subject—the Church itself has become conscienceless, the vast majority of her members doing the bidding of slaveholders, at the ballot-box—speaking lightly of the sufferings of the slave—and continuing to place on the platform of citizenship—closing their pulpits against the earnest advocacy of his rights, and rejecting the claims of humanity in the person of the slave.

The Church should ever be in the van, and faithfully conduct the world in duty and up to God. That the Churches in this land have not done this in reference to slavery, is the palpable, withering fact, and scoffers join the world in pressing the charge upon them. They should know enough of the philosophy of this reform to understand that if they do not co-operate, it will be perfected without them; and that co-operation for the removal of slavery is something more than profession of hatred for it, connected with uniform recognition of the slaveholder as a Christian brother, and thus conferring upon him their highest approval, when they know that in reference to his slaves he violates most deeply the law of love.

Not that the anti-slavery enterprise can triumph with "no Christ in it," nor that we expect to make any advance by repudiating the true Church of Christ. But understand, it is the true Church which embodies the re-

liable materials—not the mere nominal Church, but good and holy men, the really pious associated, with their hope in God, to enlighten the public mind, and to produce the conviction that the slave is a brother, and to be allowed all his rights as a man, and that legislation and practice do not change the nature of justice, or render obsolete the application of fundamental law. In such an association alone, pre-eminently entitled to the appellation of a Church, is found an element sufficient to grapple with the system of American Slavery—the impressive, irresistible element of religion among the people—the deep, vital idea of duty which governs the heart, disciplined by the teachings of the Gospel. The power of the element must be embodied. To cherish and to develop it were the ordinances of the Gospel appointed. No discerning statesman or politician, especially no patriot, will overlook or undervalue these facts.

From the National Era.

Mr. Cilley.

We supposed, from a mere glance at the revised speech of Mr. Cilley, when it was handed to us for publication, that the questionable portions of it, as originally reported in the National Intelligencer, had been amended; but, on reading it over carefully, we must confess our disappointment. It is not such a speech as was to be expected from an anti-slavery man. It takes right ground in recommending the withdrawal of our troops from Mexico, but assigns very poor reasons for it. Above all, it is sadly deficient, in not pronouncing a plain, hearty, unqualified sentence of condemnation upon the war, its authors and abettors.

While upon this topic, we must express our mortification on another account. The Bugle, of Salem, Ohio, publishes the following letter:

WASHINGTON, Feb. 12, 1847.
DEAR SIR: As I am not yet in favor of a dissolution of the Union of the United States, I return the petition directed to me with a request to present them to the Senate of the United States.

Yours, respectfully,
J. CILLEY.

BENJ. S. JONES, Esq., Salem, O.
This is a strange letter. If we are not in favor of a dissolution of the Union, we are not in favor of a petition directed to me with a request to present them to the Senate of the United States. We should deem it a terrible calamity; but what right has Mr. Cilley, or any other Senator, to set up his judgment, as law, for any portion of the people, and tell them what they shall and shall not petition for? The ground assumed by the venerable Adams should be sustained by every lover of freedom. We go for the right of petition, unqualifiedly—a right before the Constitution and under the Constitution—a right, inherent in human nature, in bond and free, alien and native. Let there be no gagging by Congress as a body, or by Congressmen individually.

BENJOS AYRES.—The Legislature of the Oriental Republic of the Uruguay, have sanctioned the following law:

1. Slavery is forever abolished in this Republic.
 2. From the time of the promulgation of the present law, all those slaves who have not been previously emancipated *de jure*, in virtue of the Constitution or other laws, and decrees anterior or subsequent thereto, enter into the full enjoyment of their liberty.
 3. The value of the manumitted slaves to whom the foregoing refers, is a debt contracted by the nation.
 4. The owners of those slaves shall receive from the national treasury a just compensation according to law.
- Approved on the 28th, and signed,
ORIBE.

Anti-Slavery Books

Kept constantly on hand by J. Elizabeth Jones, among which are
The Furlon Hope.
Memoir of Torrey.
Fact and Fiction.
Anti-Slavery Alphabet.
Madison Papers.
Narrative of Douglass.
The Liberty Cap.
Brotherhood of Thieves.
Slaveholder's Religion.
Christian Non-Resistance.
Disunionist, &c.
N. B. Most of the above works can be procured of Betsey M. Cowles, Austinsburg.

JUST RECEIVED

A Large and Complete Assortment of PHONOGRAPHIC BOOKS, And also a full set of FOWLER'S WORKS by Galbreath & Holmes, and for sale at the SALEM BOOKSTORE.
March 22, 1847.

THE SALEM BOOK-STORE

Has changed hands, and the New Firm having made considerable additions to the old stock, respectfully solicit the patronage of the old customers and the public. They are constantly receiving
SUPPLIES FROM THE EAST, of Books and Stationery,—and Articles in their line not on hand will be ordered on short notice.
They will try to keep such an assortment and sell on such terms, as that no one need have an excuse for not reading.
Schools and Merchants supplied on liberal terms.

GALBREATH & HOLMES.

D. L. GALBREATH, &
JESSE HOLMES,
Salem, 1st mo. 28th, 1846.

WATER CURE.

DR. J. D. COPE

Has just completed an addition to his Water Cure Establishment in Salem. He is now prepared to secure to an increased number of patients the full advantages of the Hydropathic practice.
Salem, Dec. 1846.

DRY GOODS AND GROCERIES, BOOTS AND SHOES, (Eastern and Western,) Drugs and Medicines, Paints, Oil and Dye Stuffs, cheap as the cheapest, and good as the best, constantly for sale at
TRESGOTT'S,
Salem, O. 1st mo. 30th.

POETRY.

For the Anti-Slavery Bugle. The Slave's Soliloquy.

Bright waters of the valley,
Ye bring no joy to me;
Your never-dying murmur
Says "God has made us free."
But I am doomed forever
To bondage and to pain—
To drink the cup of sorrow,
And wear this galling chain.

The glorious, golden sunlight,
The free, unshackled air;
Tenth that the God of nature
Wills freedom every where.
Then why, O man unfeeling!
Dost thou a tyrant prove
When every breath of heaven
Speaks Liberty and Love.

Wadsworth, O.

[From an English book called Poetry for the People.]

LABOR.

Heart of the People! Working men!
Marrow and nerve of human powers,
Who on your sturdy backs sustain
Thro' streaming Time, this world of ours—
Hold by that title, which proclaims,
That ye are undimmed and strong,
Accomplishing whatever aims
May to the sons of earth belong.

Yet not on ye alone depend
These offices, or burdens fall;
Labor, for some or other end,
Is lord and master of us all.
The high-born youth from downy bed
Must meet the morn with horse and hound,
While industry for daily bread
Pursues afresh his wretched round.

With all his pomp of pleasure, he
Is but your working comrade now,
And shouts and wins his horn, as ye
Might whistle by the loom or plough;
In vain for him his wealth he ploughs;
Of warm repose and careless joy—
When, as ye labor to produce,
He strives, as active, to destroy.

But who is this with wasted frame,
Sad sign of vigor overwrought?
What toil can this new victim claim?
Pleasure for pleasure's sake brought.
How mean would mock her flaunting shows,
Her golden promise, if they knew
What weary work she is to do
Who have no better work to do!

And he who still and silent sits
In closed room or shady nook,
And seems to nurse his idle wit,
With folded arms or open book;
To things now working in that mind,
Your children's children will owe,
Blessings that hope has never defined,
Till from his busy thoughts they flow.

Thus all must work; with head or hand,
For self, or others, good, or ill;
Life is ordained to bear, like land,
Some fruit, he follows as it will;
Evil has force itself to sow.
Where we deny, the healthy seed—
And all our choice is this—to grow
Pasture and grain, or noxious weed.

Then in content possess your hearts,
Unconscious of each other's lot—
For those that seem the easiest parts
Have travail which we reckon not;
And he is bravest, happiest, best,
Who for the task within his span,
Earns for himself his evening rest,
And an increase of good for man.

Truth's Victory.

[Translated from a German poem in the
Ringselieder.]

Stubborn winter still is threatening while the
spring is hast'ning on,
And says he, "Why art thou coming?" in a
rough and angry tone;
Yet the sun—a soaring eagle—rises higher
every day,
And from heav'n his fire eternal shall be
never torn away.

Mark! the Judgment day approaches—then
shall God his sceptre take,
With a blow the faithless teachers to a laugh-
ing-stock shall make—
And the trumpet loud shall thunder—with a
single mighty sound,
All the walls oppression raises shall be level'd
with the ground.

Not a bolt shall be broken—wide shall
open every door,
And the chaff the winds shall scatter, while
the wheat keeps on the floor;
Life into the tomb shall totter, death shall
burst his fetters all,
From the hollow face of falsehood every paint-
ed mask shall fall.

From the Evening Post.

The Search after Rest.

BY J. CUNNINGHAM.

When first the Dove, afar and wide,
Skimmed the dark waters o'er,
To seek, beyond the heaving tide,
A green and peaceful shore.

No leafy bough, nor lifelike thyme,
Rose 'mid the swelling main—
The lone bird sought, with fluttering wing,
The hallowed Ark again.

And ever thus man's heart hath traced
A lone and weary round;
But never yet, 'mid Earth's dark waste,
A resting-place hath found.

The peace for which his spirit yearns,
Is ever sought in vain,
'Till like the Dove it homeward turns,
And finds its God again.

HAPPINESS.

To be good is to be happy; angels
Are happier than men, because they're better.
Guilt is the source of sorrow; 'tis the fiend,
The avenging fiend, that follows us behind,
With whip and stings; the blest know none
of this.

But rest in everlasting peace of mind;
And find the height of all their Heaven is
goodness.

Rowe.

MISCELLANEOUS.

From the Emancipator. HELEN GREENWOOD; OR—THE FATAL INHERITANCE.

BY MISS M. L. SWEETSER.

"Mr. Greenwood desires that you would
call at his house this evening," said my
daughter to me, as I entered the sitting-room
of my own dwelling, at the termination of a
long and fatiguing professional tour.

"Who is ill?" I inquired with some anx-
iety, for Mr. Greenwood was our village pas-
tor, and a man of high repute, by mere excel-
lence of character, had won a place in every heart,
and it now occurred to me that of late his
check had been paler and his smile more forced
and sad than previously.

"I know nothing more," replied Mary,
"then he was able to come himself," I re-
joined, my heart somewhat lightened, and
hastily partaking of the supper that waited
for me, I was soon ascending the shady
avenue that led to the "Parsonage."

An unusual silence pervaded the dwelling,
and it seemed to me that the step of the mat-
ronly house-keeper was more staid and her
countenance indicative of more sorrowful
forebodings than usual, as she silently ushered
me into the "study." Probably Mr. Green-
wood had not heard the sound of our foot-
steps, for he stood before the open fire, his
clasped hands resting upon the shelf over
it, and his head drooping upon his bosom, in
painful thought. As I entered, two large
tears fell upon the hearth-rug, and he pressed
his hands to his head with a mute expres-
sion of soul-consuming agony.

"You are ill, sir," I said with sincere
sympathy, grasping his hand, which seemed
within my own like a burning coal.
"Ill!" he replied, raising his handker-
chief for a moment to his moistened eyes;
"yes, I am ill, but it is a sickness of the
soul, not of the body."

"Such diseases come within the range of
your own prescriptions more than mine," I
returned, with what cheerfulness I could as-
sume,—"for though our friendship had been
one of many years duration, he had ever main-
tained in my presence an unwavering tran-
quility which rendered his present agitation
wholly a mystery."

"But you can aid me, doctor—at least I
trust you can," he replied, a transient ray
of hope passing over his pale features; but in
a moment it faded away, and he added so-
lemnly, "If you can give me no assistance,
to God alone must I look for strength to bear
this worst of mortal trials."

I sought for a fuller explanation of his
words—but for a time there seemed to be a
powerful struggle between his desire for my
advice and his reluctance to expose the cause
of his grief. I waited in silence the moment
when his powerful mind should indicate the
proper course to pursue, and was not sur-
prised that after a brief period he turned toward
me, again extended his hand, and said with-
out trace of his recent agitation:

"I trust to your friendship to forget the
scene you have just witnessed. I sent for
you this evening to confide to you a heart-
rending sorrow—one which for years has
lain unspoken within the depths of my
own bosom; for I imagined, though perhaps
vainly, that you could eradicate the evil, or
at least remove to a far distant day the neces-
sary exposure of this horrible secret. But to
make all more plain to you, I must revert to
my past history of which, probably you are
still ignorant. My parents died hundreds of
miles from here, confided drunkards, both of
them. By the kindness of an uncle I was
rescued from their cruelty and educated in a
refined society; but the one desire of my
youthful days was the constant presence of a
wine bottle. I cannot describe to you the
never ceasing restlessness—the constant crav-
ing for excitement—the burning, harrowing
desire for some intoxicating beverage which
night and day fired my brain, and excited to
the utmost of my ingenuity to escape the vi-
gilance of my uncle. But he watched over
me with an eagle eye, and a full knowledge
of the fatal thirst I had inherited from my
degraded parents; so that while under his su-
pervision, I never yielded to the mighty tem-
ptation. At length I left his home for college,
and dangers thickened around my path; still,
however, I struggled on, sustained by a
strong will, an iron constitution, and a pow-
erful sentiment of self respect, to which the
idea of the attending degradation was strongly
abhorrent. Every day—every hour of my
life has in some form presented to me that
never ceasing desire to which I have never
yielded. Can your imagination picture aught
of the terrible life I have carried in my bo-
som during the twenty years I have been
your pastor!—but thanks be to God, I have
never fallen!"

"Does your mind waver after such long
and noble resistance to a demon passion?"
I asked, as he paused and bent his head with
a look of unutterable anguish.

"It is not for myself that I fear," he mur-
mured slowly, without raising his head,
"but, O my God! that such a confession
should ever be required of me!—for my child
—for Helen—the only image of my sainted
wife!"

Here, his voice sunk to a hollow whisper,
and as he spoke the last words, large drops
of moisture stood upon his noble brow, and
the hand that rested within my own, sud-
denly changed from a dry, burning heat to a
clammy rigidity. A professional life of nearly
thirty years had been fraught with many
heart-rending scenes, but never in the whole
course of it had I seen a powerful mind so
completely bowed down beneath the crush-
ing weight of a careless and agonizing sor-
row. His hair was saturated with moisture—
his limbs trembled violently—he gasped,
rather than breathed; at length, with the ap-
parent helplessness of a child, he buried his
face in his hands, and wept without res-
traint.

Considering these tears as the best remedy
for his mental suffering, I made no effort
to recall his usual self-possession, but silent-
ly pondered upon the revelation he had made
to me.

"Since Mr. Greenwood's first settlement
in our village, I had been the professional at-
tendant of himself and family. Sixteen years
previous, I had exerted my utmost skill to
rescue from consumption the fair and fragile
companion of his bosom—but in vain; and
with a fond interest had I watched the dan-
gering progress of the lovely Helen. No being
of human mould could have combined more
beauty and grace than were united in her
person. Her pliant and voluptuous figure—
her small red lips—her almost transparent

complexion—her soft and slightly languish-
ing blue eyes—the dainty little curls of light
brown that nature had showered around her
brow and over a fair, white, tempting neck—
arose before my mind's eye, again and again,
and I could not resist the impression that the
father's love for himself had fallen upon his
child, and that the horrible idea he had
named was but a phantom of his own imagina-
tion. "Can a rose so fair—a plant so per-
fect, bear within it the germ of a disease so
fatal?" I asked myself, and in reply I seem-
ed to hear the thrilling echoes of Helen's
sweet voice, as if I had heard them in her
youthful sobs, or as I had heard them but
the day previous, the most musical in all the
village choir—answer, "No!"

At that moment the father's eye, calm and
peaceful as of old—rested upon my face, and
must have read some trace of my thoughts;
for, without a word, he slowly rose from his
chair and beckoned me to follow him, and led
the way into an adjoining bedroom, through
which he passed into another. It was robed
in white—pure and spotless as the heart and
life of a maiden should be, and a transient
glance convinced me that in whatever else
the fair occupant sinned, she was not deficient
in these evidences of female refinement—
neatness, order, and taste.

A cold shudder shook Mr. Greenwood's
somewhat emaciated frame as he carefully
closed the door behind us, and approaching
the bed, drew aside the muslin curtain, per-
mitting the rays of a lamp to fall for an in-
stant upon the youthful sleeper. A half-
smothered cry of anguish burst from his lips
as I involuntarily started, for at the first
glance the fearful truth was revealed—it was
the stupor of intoxication!

"Is she often thus?" I asked as I gazed
upon her eye-lids, the crimsoned and
bloated cheeks, the swollen veins of the neck,
and held for an instant her burning hands.

"No, thank God! not often," murmured
the heart-broken father, as he dropped the
curtain and returned to the "study." "Not
often, or it would be beyond my strength to
endure. The propensity early manifested
itself, and remembering the horrors of my own
life, I have never allowed her to go from me
for a day; wherever I have been she has ac-
companied me, and at night she has invari-
ably reposed in her sleeping room within my
own. Occasionally, however, she pleads a
severe headache and retired to her room dur-
ing some part of the day. Little suspecting
the cause I at one time went in to ascertain
if she was suffering much, when—Good God!
how the recollection of it fires my brain even
now!—when I found her as you have just
seen her, with a bottle of brandy under her
pillow. For two years I have carried this
degrading secret in my bosom, laboring night
and day to conquer her evil propensities, but
in vain. As I have hitherto resisted it
myself, but in vain. In spite of my vigilance,
she somewhere procured the poison, and with
a slender and yielding constitution, finds her-
self unable to resist the voice of her nature.
Tears, entreaties, appeals to her approbative-
ness, extortions of solemn promises, have
all proved fruitless;—sleeping or wak-
ing the fact is before my eyes in living,
burning characters—that my beautiful child
—the idol of my heart—is—"

"—is the idol of my heart—is,"—and he
uttered in my ear a word which to him com-
bined all the trials and torments of earth.
"Compose yourself, if possible, my dear
sir," I said, when he had finished this pain-
ful recital, and after a few minutes reflection,
I will give you my advice." A few thoughts,
however, revealed to me, how very little
medical aid could do against the constant
pleadings of that desire which had been one
of the earliest, and was still one of the strongest
peculiarities of her organization. Still,
what could I resort to should be done with-
out delay, and assuring the almost distracted
parent of my deepest sympathy, I left some
written directions, and turned my steps home-
ward. It was somewhat late when I again
entered the sitting-room, where my wife and
daughter still sat, anxious to learn the cause
of my unusual detention at the "Parsonage."

Without betraying the secret of the erring
girl, I contrived to create in the mind of my
own Mary an additional interest for the health
of her young friend, hoping she might aid
me in the plan. I was forming for her recov-
ery. What those plans were, matters not
now—it is sufficient that they partially—or
perhaps for a time, wholly succeeded, and
that the Pastor's smile was once more free
and uncheeked.

Helen Greenwood had now reached her
nineteenth year, and upon her bridal eve I
was again summoned to the "Parsonage."—
Strange and fearful thoughts revolved in my
mind, as, according to custom, I touched
with my lips the brow of the youthful bride,
all radiant with beauty and the joys of a de-
voted and requited love, and pondered with-
in myself whether the cure was a perfect one.
With his wonted vigilance, the father had
prohibited the usual accompaniment of wine,
and I fancied I saw in Helen's soft eyes a
slight look of disappointment, as she took
from the servant a cup of coffee instead of
the usual beverage; but it instantly disap-
peared beneath the sweetest smile that ever
beamed my eye, and with a determination to
banish all fears, I mingled in the gutties
of the evening. Towards its close the clergy-
man again invited me to his "study."

"I have done as you bid," said he, grasp-
ing my hand, "I have revealed to Helen's
husband her fatal inheritance, and besought
him if he still persisted in marrying her, to
watch over her private hours with a never
slumbering anxiety—to trust her not—for she
has within herself no power of resistance.—
And now, doctor, let me beseech you to re-
tain over her the influence which you at pre-
sent exert, and we may hope—yes, we will
hope. It is a blessed feeling which for many
a long year has had no existence in my bo-
som, but now it lives again as in the past,
and I owe all thanks to you."

Whatever fears I privately entertained for
Helen, I could not at that moment darken
the countenance of the good man by any
forebodings, and I soon turned the conver-
sation to the young lawyer who would soon
take her to his luxurious home in our village.
He was connected with a highly respectable
and wealthy family, by whom Helen was al-
ready idolized; so that in passing from her
father's roof, her path was strewn with
the flowers of affection and the luxuries
of wealth.

About eight months after Helen's mar-
riage, her husband was necessarily absent for
a week upon a journey whether her delicate
health prevented her attending him. Upon
the third morning after his departure, I was
hastily summoned to her residence by a ser-
vant-girl, who declared her young mistress

to be very ill. With the most intense anx-
iety, I hastened to her, and found her lying
upon the sofa in violent hysterics. A slight
examination convinced me of the cause, and
requesting to be alone with her, I applied
such remedies as gradually restored her to
consciousness and calmness.

When aware of her situation, and finding
herself alone with me, she fell upon her
knees and with streaming eyes begged—yes,
implored me to preserve her secret. "How
can I live," she exclaimed wildly, "if my
husband knows that I have yielded to such a
temptation in his absence! Forget this
doctor, or treasure it in your own bosom, and
I swear to you it shall be the last time."

My judgment hesitated—but such plead-
ings from such lips, could only have been re-
sisted by more than human stoicism, and I
yielded, at the same time picturing to her in
the most glowing colors the injuries she was
heaping upon herself—and the poisoned ar-
row she would plant in her husband's bosom,
if she again so far forgot herself as to place
the wine glass to her lips.

I remained with her during the day, and
towards evening she accompanied me home
to spend the remaining interval till his re-
turn.

Some eleven or twelve months had elap-
sed, when a little daughter—an infant Helen
—was committed to her care. With all the
newly awakened tenderness and solicitude of
a young mother, she gazed upon the features
of her babe, and I fancied I could read in
that glance a love which would be an anchor
to her wavering soul. The silent pressure
of the father's hand, convinced me that the
same love dawned upon his mind; but alas!
how useless as to build up human hopes where-
on to defy the operations of Nature.

Frequent temptations brought with them
more frequent opportunities for indulgence,
and, as when I first saw her, a bottle of wine
or brandy was now concealed beneath the
pillow when she took her afternoon nap.

With an anguish equalled only by that of
her father, the young and noble-hearted hus-
band came to me, placed his ample fortune
at my disposal, and in words that came from
and penetrated to the heart, implored me to
save her. In accordance with my advice and
as a final effort to redeem his bride, he com-
mitted their only child to the care of a faith-
ful woman, and commenced a series of trav-
els, residing sometimes here and sometimes
there, but keeping up a constant and active
correspondence.

Six years passed in this manner, during
which her husband's confidence remained
unshaken, when the precarious health of the
little girl demanded a permanent residence,
and they again sought their native village.

I was called to the child immediately, and
was startled by the peculiar expression of
settled melancholy upon its pale, wan face,
from which was completely banished every
mark of childhood. There was, in the eyes
of the young mother, as she bent over the
suffering sufferer, a look of silent gladness
which I could not interpret.

"I fear your child must die," I said, to
destroy any false hope that she might be
nourishing in her bosom.

"I know it! I do not wish her to live,"
she replied, raising her large soft eyes to
mine, when doubtless she felt some reproach,
for instantly bursting into tears, she threw
herself into my arms saying, "O Doctor,
you know not what I suffer—hitherto you
have saved me—you cannot do it longer—at
this moment, dearly as I love my husband
and child—much as I value my reputation, I
confess to you, that I would barter all for one
glass of wine! O God! how this thirst
consumes me! And she too—my darling
child—is devoured with the same hideous
passion; can I wish her to live, and endure
day by day—hour by hour, the tortments that
rack my soul?" Once more I urged upon
Helen those considerations that had been
most powerful in restraining her, but she only
shook her head despairingly, saying in a
subdued whisper, "Make her path smooth
and easy to the tomb. O would I too had
found an early grave!"

I once more sought the study of Mr. Green-
wood, and told my fears respecting his daugh-
ter, and what I knew must soon be the fate
of the little one. With the external calmness
of despair, but with an intensity of anguish
known only to him who had seen the life-
long struggle of the pure-hearted christian,
he listened to the close, and bowing his ven-
erable head upon his trembling hands, mur-
mured, "Suffer this cup, O my God, to pass
from me!"

Awed by the presence of so great a sor-
row, I remained a few moments in profound
silence; at length, however, I attempted some
slight consolation, but in a voice so hollow
that it seemed to proceed from the tomb, he
replied,

"Be with me a little my friend and leave
me for the present; call to-morrow at ten
and I will go with you to see her."

Preparing for him a small powder which
he promised to take, I departed, not however
without some compunctions of conscience in
leaving him alone.

After an almost sleepless night, I fulfilled
my promise to Mr. Greenwood, and supported
him, as with slow and feeble steps he de-
scended from the carriage and entered the
manion of his daughter. The little sufferer
lay pale and gasping in the arms of his grief-
stricken father, and a glance showed me that
death had already marked her for his own.

The Pastor leaned forward and gazed for a
moment into the little face—so striking a re-
semblance in feature of his doomed and er-
ring Helen, and then looked inquiringly
about as if he desired the presence of the ab-
sent one.

In a low voice I asked for her. A flood of
crimson overspread the countenance of the
husband, and slightly raising one hand to-
wards the draped bed in the corner, he
bowed his head near the bosom of his dying
child. Good God! there lay the beloved
wife—the cherished idol of a father's heart,
in a state of beastly intoxication!

"Arm yourself now, old man, with all thy
fortitude," I said mentally, "for thou art
about to consume the very dregs of the bitter
cup of woe from which thou didst pray to be
released."

"Helen, your child is dying," I said, en-
deavoring to arouse her. She slowly un-
closed her eyes, but it was only to gaze on
vacancy.

"Helen," I exclaimed with another effort,
"do you not wish to see your babe once
more? she is dying."

"Dying!" she repeated incoherently, pas-
sing her hand several times across her fore-
head, to recall her scattered senses. "Dy-
ing—yes I know—I gave it to her—she loves
it and I could not be cruel to her, I gave it
to her—I will give her more."

She evidently neither understood her situ-
ation nor that of the child, and was fast re-
lapsing into a state of insensibility, when
the sepulchral voice of her father fell upon
her in mingled tones of pity and reproach—
Almost instantly she was herself, and spring-
ing from my arms, knelt beside him, bury-
ing her face in his bosom. With a tenderness
peculiar to the palliating circumstances
of the case, the aged man feebly clasped his
arms about her drooping form, and bending
his head till his thin pale cheek, rested
among her clustering curls, murmured, "Save
her, great God, O save her from herself!"

The faint moanings of the little one had
meanwhile ceased, and the wretched parent
gazed upon its lifeless form, as it lay so still
upon his knees—in all the agony of an in-
soluble grief. Somewhat alarmed by the
death pangs of the clergyman's countenance,
I expressed some fears for him and requested
Helen to rise, but alas! it was very nearly
the embrace of Death. His arms fell help-
less by his side—his eyes were fixed and
glassy, and though evidently somewhat con-
scious, he could not speak. With the ut-
most caution I removed him to his own dwell-
ing, hoping, by the absence of his daughter
and the presence of familiar objects to restore
the connecting link that bound him to earth,
but it had been too nearly severed, and in a
few days his spirit passed gently and peace-
fully to that land whither he had so often
watched the departure of others.

Two years after, I ministered to the dying
agonies of the beautiful Helen. From the
death of her father, she had yielded herself
without restraint to the overwhelming desire
of her life, and at last became the victim of
Delirium Tremens.

Her husband, faithful though still, stood
beside her grave with a tearful eye; but the
blanched cheek—the hair prematurely silvered—
the slightly stooping form, and above all
the expression of stern, forced resignation,
proved that with the chosen one of his heart,
all his hopes of earthly happiness had de-
parted.

Managing Children.

"Don't break it, Jose," said the fond
mother, as she gave the darling little boy the
looking-glass. Little Jose, as his mother
called him, notwithstanding he had toys
enough for any reasonable child, one day took
it into his head that he should be quite hap-
py if he could have the looking-glass added
to the number. "The looking-glass," said
his mother, "why, child, who ever heard of
such a thing?" Jose straightway began to
be importunate, "ma, ma, I want the glass."

"Poh, poh," said his mother, "do you think
I am going to give you the looking-glass to
play with? You would break it, and cut
your fingers with it, and then we should have
to send for the doctor!" "I shan't break it;
I won't cut my fingers; let me have it,"
and then he laid hold of his mother's gown
in good earnest. After being dragged across
the room a few times, Jose began to cry;
and his mother's patience being quite ex-
hausted, she took him off, saying, "Joe, you
shan't have the looking-glass, there! now go
about your business."

Hereupon his mother's wrath was kindled;
she called for a naughty boy, and threatened
to tell his father of him, and he would take
a stick to him, and shut him up in the dark
hole. At this Jose took a pinch one note high-
er, (as we musicians say,) and trilled away
a most lamentable solo. His mother, who
had no ear for music, became alarmed. She
feared he would burst a blood-vessel, or die
with rage, and just at this moment sundry
stories of such accidents flitted across her
mind with fearful reality. Jose's lungs held
out wonderfully, and after every bar's rest, he
raised his voice a semi-tone, until he scream-
ed terrific in the space above. What was to
be done? Half crazy with noise and ap-
prehension, she attempted to pacify little
Jose by offering him the pincushion, the
story-book, the little tea-set—but all would
not do, his heart was upon the looking-glass,
and he would cry his eyes out if he could
not have it. At last his afflicted mother
yielded. She took down the looking-glass
and gave it to him, saying, "There, I de-
clare you are the best all—take it and you
will, but don't break it, Jose."

Now the reader may be curious to know what became
of Jose and the looking-glass. It is no mat-
ter. I suppose he broke it and cut his fin-
gers into the bargain; but I wish to turn his
attention to the mother rather than to the
child. In the first place, she was faulty in
not refusing to grant Jose's request in the be-
ginning. In the second place, she was
faulty in endeavoring to terrify him by the
doctor and the dark hole. And in the third
place, she was wicked in telling him a down-
right falsehood. Many mothers, and fathers
too, who would not tell a lie for their right
hands, are guilty of such conduct, almost ev-
ery day, with their intercourse with their
children. No wonder that so many children
grow up to lie and steal and go to the house
of correction and the state prison. Take a
tenant of the state prison and go back to his
early history, and, ten to one, his mother gave
him the looking-glass to play with.

Lying is one of the crying sins of the
times. It is one of those sins which rests
with tremendous weight upon the heads of
parents. Look at the merchant, determined
to amass a fortune at all hazards—count up
the lies he will tell in order to secure a bargain.
—I dare say his father, when he was a child,
never subdued his temper, and his mother
gave him the looking-glass to play with, be-
cause she could think of nothing else to pa-
cify him. See the politician who does not
scruple to circulate the most barefaced false-
hoods, in order to secure the election of his
favorite candidate, not however without the
hope of reward. I mistrust that his mother
gave him the looking-glass to play with. If
our country is well nigh ruined by lying po-
liticians, and lying lawyers, and lying teach-
ers, let the mothers look to it. They bear,
strange as the doctrine may seem, the ark of
our liberties, and if they give looking-glasses
to their children a little longer, we shall go
into captivity.

The Racine Advocate publishes the
following text and unique context:
"Canst thou send lightnings, that they
may go, and say unto thee, Here we are!"—
Job.

"Yes, Sir-o-o-o."—PROFESSOR MORSE.

A methodist and a quaker having
stopped at a public house, agreed to sleep in
the same bed. The methodist knelt down,
and confessed a long catalogue of sins. Af-
ter he rose, the quaker observed, "Really,
friend, if thou art as bad as thou sayest thou
art, I dare not sleep with thee."

LOOKING GLASSES.

In connection with Hardware and Drugs,
the subscribers have a large supply of new
and handsome styles of large and small Look-
ing Glasses and Looking Glass plates.
Old frames refilled and glass cutting done
to order.

CHESSMAN & WRIGHT.
Salem, 11th mo 1, 1846.

CHEAP FOR CASIL.

The proprietors of the Salem
HARDWARE AND DRUG STORE,
have just received their full supply of
NEW HARDWARE and FRESH DRUGS.
The patronage of their old customers, and
the public generally is respectfully solicited.
CHESSMAN & WRIGHT.
Salem 11th mo 1, 1846.